COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME XXIV.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
1904.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NUMBER 1.

PAGE

Introductory. By the Editor 1
Religious Tolerance. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D. 9
The Division of the Decalogue. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 22
The Question of Higher Education in our Synod. By Prof. Carl Ackerman 27
The Believer's Final Acquittal. By Rev. J. Sheatsley 38
Notes and News. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D 53

NUMBER 2.

The Analogy of Faith. By Rev. C. C. Hein 65
Philosophic Thought in its Bearing on Theology. A Lecture by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D 84
Some early Lutheran Hymn Books. By E. E. Daume 99
The Overtures from the Lima Lutheran Educational Association to the Joint Synod. By Prof. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D 113
Notes and Items. By Prof G. H. Schodde, Ph. D 119

NUMBER 3.

The Predestination Controversy. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D 129
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D 150
Theology and the Scriptures. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 158
Our Practical Attitude towards other Lutheran Bodies. By Rev. A. O. Swinehart 166
Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger, A. M 176
Notes and News. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D 187

NUMBER 4.

Baccalaureate Sermon. By Professor Edward Pfeiffer 193
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D 204
The Thorough Preparation for the Catechetical Class. By Rev. F. W. Abicht 212
Does the Spirit of Missions Exist in Our Synod in its True Character? By Rev. Joseph Beck, A. M 220

PAGE
Development in Theology. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.. 229
The Peace of the Church under Constantine. By Rev. J. C. Schacht 238
Christian or Evangelical Liberty. By Rev. P. A. Peter..... 243
Notes and News. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 253

NUMBER 5.

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M. 257
The Apologetical Character of the New Testament. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 269
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D..... 277
The Thorough Preparation for the Catechetical Class. By Rev. F. W. Abicht, A. B..... 285
Christian or Evangelical Liberty. By Rev. P. A. Peter..... 297
Spiritual Gifts, Transient and Permanent. By Rev. R. E. Golladay 307

NUMBER 6.

The Precious Old Truths of the Reformation. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 322
The Unity of the Scriptures. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 351
The Practical Treatment of Secretists in Church and Mission Work. By Rev. J. M. Senter..... 359
New Testament Apocryphal Books. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 369
Synodical Sermon. By Rev. O. S. Oglesby, A. M..... 379
Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 382

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. FEBRUARY, 1904. No. 1.

INTRODUCTORY.

BY THE EDITOR.

With the present issue the THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE enters upon its twenty-fourth volume. It is a singular coincidence that the very problem that nearly a quarter of a century ago called this periodical into existence has now again become the leading church question in the Lutheran church of America, the purpose being, if possible, to again unite the bodies that then were arrayed against each other in hostile ranks through the Predestination controversy. Two inter-synodical conferences have already been held, one in Watertown, Wis., in April and the other early in September in Milwaukee, and a third is to convene in the Easter week in Detroit, to devise ways and means for a reunion of the strictly confessional and conservative Synods of the West on a truly Biblical and confessional basis. The phenomenal attendance at these two conventions already held, that in Milwaukee numbering almost eight hundred men, shows how wide and deep is this desire for a union of hearts and hands for the best interests of the Lutheran church. The movement itself is a spontaneous development from within the church itself and is in no manner or way an official agitation. It is entirely the work of the younger element in the various synods interested, which has no personal recollection of the ups and downs of the great controversy itself and for that reason is probably best in a condition to discuss the antagonizing positions independently and objectively

and without personal bias and prejudice. Fortunately these latter features have not appeared at all in the discussions so far, even if these debates have been almost exclusively carried on by the veterans on both sides who originally stood in the front ranks. The younger generation has so far not yet supplied a single leader in the contest. All these things are auspicious and indicate that if the matter itself can be adjusted and if a reconciliation is objectively a possibility at all, personalities and controversial bitterness will not prevent this consummation. From this point of view the matter has progressed in a model manner, and at least one thing has been definitely gained, namely that the earnest motives of either side will not be impugned by the protagonist of the other. Each side has gained the respect and no doubt also the good will of the other. A good beginning in the adjustment of the difficulties has been made.

But how about the consummation of the matter? Are matters in such a shape that we can reasonably expect that these free conferences will end in an agreement and in harmonizing the differences? At the present status it does not look so. Objectively little has been gained except that the *status controversiae* has been put into a clearer light than it ever had been before, but this clearness has not yet shown a common ground as a basis for agreement. It is now seen better than ever before that back of the Predestination controversy itself there is a disagreement as to the principles of interpretation, which shall determine the sense of the Scripture passages that here come into consideration. A fundamental difference has been found where it was little or not at all expected, namely, in the application of the time-honored hermeneutical principle of the Analogy of Faith. The Lutheran church, from its conception of the Sacred Scriptures as the work of the one Holy Spirit, though speaking through Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles and in their writings accommodating Himself to the individuality of the human agents, nevertheless revealed but *one* truth that forms and constitutes one harmonious whole. The old rule that the difficult and dark passages are to be

interpreted in the light of the clear statements of the Scriptures practically has been regarded in the light of an axiom in the Lutheran church all along. Cf. citations from the best authorities in Dr. Stellhorn's article in the November number of the *Theological Zeitblaetter.* It is largely on the basis of this accepted principle of our church that the defenders of the *intuitu fidei* have taken their stand, the passages referring to Predestination and Election being interpreted in the light of the clear, emphatic and uniform teachings of the Scriptures on the universal call to grace and the redemption through the merits of Christ alone.

It now appears that the defenders of the Synodical conference view, which denies the *intuitu fidei,* do so largely on the basis of a modification of the analogy of faith rule. This principle they apply not to the whole Scriptures as the expression of a uniform system of truth but restrict its application to certain groups of doctrine, maintaining that only the passages that pertain to one particular subject or doctrine must be harmonized with each other, even should the resultant teaching be seemingly — for really it never is — in contradiction with the resultant teaching of the passages on another subject. Accordingly they take what in their estimation constitutes the *sedes doctrinae* for the Predestination dogma, and which at most contain the *intuitu fidei* only by implication and draw from this comparison a doctrine of election unto faith, without pretending even to bring this into harmony with the general teachings of the Scriptures on faith as the sole condition for the acceptance of Christ and hence a *sine qua non* of salvation. It is in this restriction and limitation of the principle of the analogy of faith that a new debatable land has been discovered between the contending hosts and this is to constitute the special subject of discussion between them at the coming convention at Detroit, as it is self-evident that the Scriptural doctrine on the subject cannot be settled to the satisfaction of all concerned until there is an agreement on the rule for Scriptural interpretation. It is of course neither wise nor proper to anticipate the coming discussion, but a word

or two on the new departure can scarcely be suppressed. There can be no doubt that the Synodical Conference men by their limitation of the analogy of faith rule have introduced something new into Lutheran theology. It is contrary to the expressed and to the implied teachings of our church all along and doubtlessly too contrary to the methods and manners that have been in vogue in the Missouri synod. Attention here need only be drawn, e. g. to Hofmann's Latin work on Hermeneutics, which the Missourians themselves have re-published as a text book for theological seminaries and which plainly teaches the traditional view as presented by the Ohio Synod men. Cf. Dr. Stellhorn's article already cited. The Synodical Conference is accordingly in the same plight in which it found itself in the Predestination controversy, namely, that it, the very body that put upon its banner the device of reviving the pure theology of the best days of Lutheranism antagonizes on a fundamental rule of interpretation the unanimous teachings of the church and its own history.

Another thought that cannot be suppressed is the danger that lurks in this restriction of a universal rule of Scriptural interpretation. It might lead, and in fact does logically lead to the position, that in the Scriptures are contained various groups of dogmas and doctrines that however consistent with themselves yet may be mutually exclusive and contradictory, not only seemingly but also in fact. It is really also based on a *petitio principii* in determining what are the real "seats of doctrine," leaving this entirely to be the arbitrary selection of anybody, and there is no reason why James in his teachings of the relation of works to faith should not be taken as a "seat of doctrine," as well as the Pauline exposition in Romans and Ephesians on justification. But no passage can be such a "seat" unless it, in addition to speaking of the matter *ex professo,* does so also clearly and in harmony with the one truth of Scriptures. According to the new application of this old rule it is difficult to see why a person should be denied the privilege of looking for the "seat of doctrine" on the Pre-

destination matter in Romans 9 and 11. Evidently this whole innovation is not something that is merely *nove;* it is a *novum,* and at bottom may indicate more than a mere difference in the interpretation of certain passages and the definition of a certain doctrine. It may be the surface sign of two trends or schools of theology and if that is the case the coming discussions will only emphasize the differences. It is distinctly disappointing that this is the case, but facts are stubborn things and must be dealt with as facts. The case is not altogether hopeless, but the ground for hope is slight and slim. The one or the other party must yield to its antagonist; a common and mutual middle ground between the two seems impossible to find. But even with this doubtful outcome, the inter-synodical conferences will in all probability do a good work. Even if no agreement or even a *modus vivendi* is formally reached, it seems clear that the day of recrimination is passed when "Synergist" was heard on the one side and "Calvinist" on the other. Possibly too ,the day of altar and counter-altar will be passed and at worst an armed neutrality will obtain. No synod has as yet taken official notice of the agitation for peace, except that several districts have spoken warm words of commendation. It is quite apparent that in the near future an interesting and doubtlessly important chapter in the history of the Lutheran Church in America will be enacted.

While the Lutheran Church during the period that has elapsed since the establishment of this periodical has on the whole been doctrinally *in statu quo,* with prevailing confessional tendencies even in those branches where liberal trends had been the order of the day before, the very opposite has been the case in the other leading denominations in this country. There can be no denial of the fact that in the other strong branches of Protestantism in America there has been a steady and constantly growing departure from the principles of the Reformation. This is owing chiefly to the detrimental influence of the newer Biblical criticism, which the American churches have only been too willing

to import from Germany, Holland and England. It is really remarkable how readily American Protestant journals and ministers will accept contradictions and errors in the Scriptures without seemingly being able to understand that thereby they virtually cast aside the very foundation of their faith and church. The most rampant expression of neological and destructive theology is found in the productions of English and American theologians. The *Encyclopaedia Biblica* edited by Professor Cheyne, claiming for itself to be the greatest exponent of advanced theology in the English language, has seemingly no other purpose than to throw aside everything in doctrine and faith that has furnished the vitality to the Protestant church since the days of the Reformation. Journals like the *Outlook* and the *Independent,* vie with each other in the defense of an "undogmatical Christianity" and the substitution in the place of historical Protestantism of a vague and visionary moral scheme that is little higher and deeper than a heathen system of ethics in which Christ occupied only the position of a great philosopher and a model man and an exemplary leader, but has been deposed from this high and exalted position of Savior of mankind. The work of Atonement has been reduced to a Pauline misconstruction of the pristine teachings of original Christianity and practically little or nothing of what has all along been deemed the heart of positive and Evangelical Christianity yet remains. At bottom modern advanced theology, as represented in the views of leading representatives of other denominations, is not a modification of the Christianity of other days, but its abrogation. It is a new creed, a new gospel, a new faith, which sees in Christianity at best only the highest development of natural religious thought, but differing from other religions only in degree but not in kind. It is scarcely possible to picture in too black colors the present tendencies in advanced critical and theological thought. The most amazing feature about the whole matter is the indifference with which these developments are regarded by the sects in general. It is a case of ecclesiastical and theological suicide a

thousand times more direful in its results than the famous race suicide that so deeply concerns the people at large.

While it is true that not all of the advocates of this modern type of theological thought accept or sanction these extreme radicalisms, it is doubly gratifying that neither in its advanced nor in its milder form, this tendency has been able to find any lodgment in the Lutheran Church of this country. This is all the more remarkable because it is in the Lutheran church of Germany too where these tendencies flourish, and from whence the non-Lutheran churches of this country get their supply of new notions and hypotheses. But the Lutheran church of this country is but very little under the influence of the theology known as Lutheran in Germany now, not even under the new Lutheranism of such schools as that of Erlangen, who claim to represent a legitimate and correct further development of the Lutheran confessions and their theology. The Lutheran church of this country finds its spiritual food in the confessional writings and in the works of its representatives of dogmatical thought in the heroic days of a Chemnitz, Quenstedt, Gerhard, Hollaz and others. It is distinctively a confessional Lutheranism that has found its firm foothold in the thought our church in this country, and accordingly too the newer doctrinal developments in the Lutheran church in Germany are not regarded as legitimate and lawful outgrowths of the principles of the Church of the Reformation but rather departures from the old landmarks of faith. In view of this condition of affairs it is readily understood why our church in this country can watch with interest indeed the doctrinal ups and downs in the church of the Mother country but will be little affected or influenced by these.

Accordingly then the Lutheran church in this country enjoys the distinction of being the only one among the leading denominations in which the original principles of the Reformation still hold undisputed sway. Especially is this the case with reference to the formal principle, namely, that the Word of God is the absolute and sole guide and

rule of faith and life. All the more should the Lutheran church accordingly be on its guard to preserve this rare and providential blessing and show its appreciation of this possession by an earnest and independent study of this Word of God. Often it seems that there is ground for complaint that our pastors do not intelligently and independently give an account to themselves of the reasons why they so strictly adhere to the Scriptures or this inspired Word of God. The charge is not infrequently made that the methods by which the conservative and orthodox Lutheran learns to accept the Scriptures and the doctrinal systems of the church is essentially Roman Catholic in nature, i. e. is based solely on authority and is not the result of a careful, impartial examination of the reasons for and against these positions. It must be acknowledged that there is such a thing as a "dead orthodoxy," not only in the sense that a true faith may be such only formally and is not a vital force productive of good results, but also in this sense that a theological system is adopted and accepted mechanically and without an honest examination of its claims. Such a method and manner is directly antagonistic to the cardinal Protestant principles of the rights of individual conscience and the duty of private judgment. But how easy it is for a man to accept a system of faith on authority, if not of a church, then of certain individuals. It is the easiest way to come to a settled conclusion and certainly saves a man a great deal of work and research. That something of this spirit is in the Lutheran church of this country there are some reasons to believe, as is evident from the fact that the men of our church take so small a part in the discussion of the leading church problems of the day. Very few of the Lutherans of this country seem to be students in the best sense of the word; their literary activity amounts to practically nothing. The way that proof-passages are handled in the dogmatical discussions at synodical conventions and conferences makes them as a rule only a sort of a formal appendix to the discussion proper. The Lutheran pastor should be well grounded in the Biblical foundations of his faith, and

for that reason should ordinarily and constantly make really independent and impartial examinations of the proof-passages, especially for the distinctive doctrines of the church. Direct and systematic Bible study, especially on the Biblical sources of the teachings of the church, should be the serious matter for every Lutheran pastor, to which too much attention cannot be paid. Not so much or so many books about the Bible, but the Bible itself, should be the constant object of the Lutheran minister's study and prayer. As it has providentially fallen to the lot of the Lutheran Church in this country to become the stronghold of Biblical truth, it should be first and foremost the concern of every earnest pastor of the Lutheran church as far as he is concerned to understand intelligently the great problems that now circle around the Bible and be able to give an answer for his faith of such a character that it will convince, not an answer based on authority or ignorance, but on a knowledge of the facts in the case. A man may be an orthodox Lutheran pastor simply because he is stubborn and stupid; but these are not the men who best represent their church and its faith. The historic position of the Lutheran church in this country ought to make every Lutheran pastor a persistent and earnest Bible student for both offensive and defensive warfare with the representatives of neological theological thought.

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Happily the principles of toleration in regard to religious differences is generally accepted among civilized nations, and grows in popularity as civilization advances. The Reformation has brought light among the people and has rendered religious persecution odious. That many who properly prize and praise this toleration do not give the honor in this respect to Luther and his coadjutors which is their due does not change the fact. It is a common error

to attribute this and all the blessings of liberty to the civilization which we have attained, without recognizing the Reformation as the prime factor in that civilization itself. But deplorable as it is that credit is not given where it is due and that to this extent the glorious Reformation is depreciated, it is still fortunate that the results are accepted and prized.

But unhappily, no doubt as a consequence of the failure rightly to appreciate the Lutheran Reformation, an element of confusion which works disastrously has been introduced into the subject. The distinction between Church and State, and the purpose and powers of each, has not been fully and effectually realized, and, as a consequence of this, tolerance has been demanded and contended for where it cannot be conceded and where, strictly speaking, the question is utterly irrelevant. It can properly arise only when the civil power is concerned: ecclesiastical power, which involves only the application and enforcement of the eternal will of God as revealed in Holy Scripture, has no authority to grant or deny it. The Church must tolerate what God tolerates, and has no power to add to this or substract from it. In her courts therefore all questions of tolerance are forever settled by the unalterable decrees of her King. His loyal subjects can tolerate nothing which He forbids and can forbid nothing which He commands or even permits. His Word is absolutely decisive in His kingdom, and only by rebellion against His authority, from which there can be no appeal, is it possible that disputes should arise on the question of tolerance, so far as the principle is under discussion. It is of essential importance for the elucidation of our subject that it be kept fully in mind that the Church is a kingdom which is not of this world, and that it is governed only by the Word of God, given us in Holy Scripture, whose decision in all cases is final. If any one will not submit to this, he puts himself beyond the jurisdiction of the Church and she has nothing further to do with him than to use her means for his conversion. Such a thing as persecution is not at all in her province.

The purpose for which the State is instituted and the means committed to it for the accomplishment of its ends are fundamentally different. In its domain the question of the tolerance of various religions and of the persecution of religionists whose practices may be regarded as adverse to the welfare of the community may easily arise and often has arisen. To this point the discussion of religious tolerance must address itself, if valuable results are to be attained. But the attainment of such results is hopeless as long as Church and State are confounded. The result of such confusion will always lead to wrongs.

Only to such confusion can the contention be imputed, that Protestantism and Romanism are alike in their proclivity to persecute. It is maintained that the difference between them is one of power, not of disposition, and that Protestants are as prone to persecute those who will not submit to their government as are the Romanists, and history, especially the history of our American colonies, is adduced in proof of the claim. But the contention is radically erroneous. There is some truth in it so far as the so-called Reformed parties, who declined to co-operate with Luther in the great Reformation and established a church at variance with the Lutheran, are concerned. They failed fully to grasp the difference between Church and State as the Lutheran Church set it forth, and in this as in many other respects fell into error, which to this day separates them from the great Church of the Reformation, the Evangelical Lutheran Church. As against this Church the allegation, that it is prone to persecute, is utterly untrue. It is a flagrant wrong to charge upon her the misdoings of some Protestants, who were not Lutherans and who were not faithful to the principles of Protestantism as declared in the Lutheran Confessions. The Lutheran Church could not be a persecuting Church without violating her faith, whilst Romanists only carry out their unscriptural convictions and act consistently when they seek to exterminate heresy by torturing and burning heretics.

To those who have given little or no thought to the subject our contention that the Lutheran is the most liberal and most tolerant of all churches, and probably the only church which cannot persecute without violation of its own principles,' must seem strange, to some even preposterous, in view of the persistent charge of her enemies, that she is the most intolerant of all churches. The explanation is not hard to find. If the difference between Church and State were duly recognized, many a cloud would be lifted from the subject.

The civil government was not instituted to control the consciences of men, or to regulate their lives with a view to their happiness in the world beyond. It has nothing to do with their inner life, except so far as this becomes manifest in their outward actions as violations of law. A person may think as he pleases, influential as those thoughts may be on his desires and purposes. The state has nothing to do with his private thoughts. It cannot judge the heart, and always makes bad work of it when it presumes to transcend its powers. Only external actions, as those bear on the peace and welfare of society, lie within the scope of its authority. It is therefore always wrong when it is intolerant of creeds or opinions that do not lie in its province, or persecutes people for utterances in this respect. Only when these utterances become dangerous to society, can the persons making them become justly amenable to the civil law and the punishment which it imposes. There are thus two aspects presented of a case claiming tolerance. A religious sect, no matter how preposterous its tenets, the State has no right to persecute. Beliefs and opinions lie outside of its domain. People may think as they please. Even when they express foolish thoughts on religion, the civil government has no calling to rebuke the folly or to punish the fool. Indeed it would have a hard task before it if it went out of its way to try it.

Of course when such fools violate the law, the fact that their crimes are the outcome, professedly or really, of their religious opinions cannot make the law of none effect, or

screen the law-breakers from punishment. Violations of the law are to be treated as the law provides, and no one can be exempted from such treatment on the alleged ground that his opinions, religious or otherwise, lie outside of the statutes. Civil government has nothing directly to do with religion, though a professed religion may be so depraved that its practice may involve crime and this must be dealt with as such, just as in any other case. If Mormons practice polygamy and Jesuits engage in conspiracy and Masons control courts adverse to right, the State, which has no right to meddle with people's religion is bound to punish them as criminals, without regard to their Mormon or Jesuitic or Masonic tenets as religionists. The civil government must be tolerant of all religions, and persecution of any of its citizens because of their religion is always a wrong. Religious persecution is indefensible on any grounds or in any circumstances. Our country is happy in its tolerance of all creeds, and has no reason to become uneasy when criminals clamor for license under religious pretences. Religion is no excuse for unrighteousness.

But the subject presents a different aspect when it is regarded in its relation to the Church. This is an institution of our Lord which is not of this world. It has different aims and powers and means from that which characterizes the divine institution of civil government. It is declared to be a kingdom which is not of this world, and this declaration will be a guide to the right understanding of its position in regard to tolerance as in regard to many another topic.

When the redemption of our race was accomplished by the life and death of our Savior, the Gospel was preached to all nations, and those who believed formed a kingdom under the dominion of the great King, whose reign is absolute and everlasting. His was not a kingdom in opposition to the existing civil governments which He had instituted, but one into which all nations were to be gathered without any interference with the existing earthly governments. His was a spiritual government, which was altogether dif-

ferent from the governments which pursued earthly ends, and beyond these had no significance. The kingdom thus formed was organized in this world as the Church, which is the congregation of believers, who accepted Him as their Lord and Savior. To this Church He gave His Word and Sacraments, by which He exercises His spiritual power to the end of time. By these alone He builds and perpetuates His kingdom on earth, and by these He works the faith which saves the soul, and which alone is the condition of membership in His kingdom.

Of necessity this difference in the nature and purpose and powers of the two kinds of government must place them in different relations to tolerance.

Perhaps a clearer expression would be given to the thought by saying that there are two kinds of tolerance, which are so different in their relations and consequently in their nature, that they may come in conflict with each other, and grievous errors arise when they are confounded. The application of the same name to things that are different is always unfortunate. In the present use it darkens counsel and frequently does injustice to man who seek righteousness.

The civil government is intolerant when it deprives citizens of common rights, and subjects them to pains and penalties because of their religious beliefs. This is persecution, which civilization is supposed to have banished. Undoubtedly as progress is made in the knowledge and recognition of human rights, larger liberty of thought must result. But those always err who imagine that the Reformation had little or nothing to do with the progress made, or that natural enlightenment has wrought the change, or will suffice to do away with the persecution still abounding on earth. The State has no right to punish people for their religion, which is a matter of the individual conscience, but the truth in this regard is not evolved from the reason of man with its variety and sub-variety of opinions, all centering in that selfishness of the human heart which no thinking can overcome. The rule of expediency

which dominates the schemes and diplomacies of nations will never lead to the complete triumph of righteousness.

Civil governments, according to divine institution, have no religion. They are ordained of God, but not with religious ends. Their office is to maintain the right, as all men in the light of conscience are able to see it, if they will. Accordingly the sword is committed to them, that evil-doers may be punished. Guided by justice to all, they must uphold the right and put down the wrong, and do this by force if evil-doers rebel. Here mercy and moral suasion, as regards the maintenance of authority, are out of place. The police is not to beg the criminal to submit and the judge must not permit his pity to thwart justice. The law must be enforced, with kindness and humanity indeed, but it must be enforced. Arrests must be made and punishments must be inflicted. No malicious pleasure in the evil-doers' suffering should exist in the heart of the officers that make the arrest and inflict the punishment. They have a duty to perform and their righteousness in this respect consists in faithfully performing it. The civil government can allow no interference with this duty by pretended philanthropists who would strive to defeat justice and undermine the government by sentimental pleas of pity, even though such pleas be made by professed ministers of the Church on profound grounds of evangelical love. To convert and save the soul is not the office of the State, and for this it has no means. The sword which is committed to it has no such powers. It must abide in its own calling on its own ground, and has enough to do in the fulfillment of its duty in its own province.

Religion does not lie in that province. We repeat it, the State as such has no religion, and could frame no just laws in regard to it. Our country is often spoken of as a Christian land, and many an argument is adduced in favor of the proposition. In some cases we must admit this argument to be historically sound, but only on the basis of false theories, some of which arose from a false apprehension or application of the doctrine of the Reformation. But

if by a Christian country be meant a land where constitution and laws are framed according to Holy Scriptures, with due submission to the law and gospel as those recorded by divine inspiration, who would maintain such an allegation? If that were the case, our government would have a large work on its hands to make fair discriminations between Christians and unbelievers, and between the different kinds and grades of unbelievers as manifested in different parts of heathenism and Judaism. And a much larger work would it have on its hands to distinguish between the different denominations of Christians, where the division into Catholics and Lutherans and Reformed would be of little service, seeing that all sorts of Catholics are presenting their claims in addition to the Greek as distinguished from the Roman, and the English as distinguished from both Roman and Greek; and every variety of Reformed sects is clamoring for recognition as the true representatives of Scriptural Christianity. We refrain from mentioning Lutherans with their glorious history in such a crowd, though their claim of recognition would be soundest of all, notwithstanding the divisions among us, which would add to the perplexities of the State in the problem supposed. But there is no such problem with which the State has to deal, and all the trouble that has come from such a source has arisen from the error of confounding things that are radically different. The idea that the State has the same offices as the Church has led to complications from which nothing can relieve us but the truth of the gospel, which teaches us of a kingdom that is not of this world and that possesses prerogatives with which civil governments, which are of this world, must not meddle, as they have no calling in the sphere of religion.

When a State prescribes religious duties and enforces them by penalties, it persecutes. The charge of intolerance is then justly made against it, and lovers of liberty must enter their protest.

But when the Church upholds its fundamental principles and exercises its divinely imparted powers, the term in-

tolerance is manifestly inapplicable in the sense in which it is applied to civil gocernments. The State violates human rights when it deprives Jews or Mohammedans of citizenship and the privileges which this implies. The laws of any land can of right be only such as will deal equal justice to all men, and the fact that a person is a Jew or a heathen or a Christian can in this respect make no difference. When one is a thief or a robber, a murderer or adulterer, the question cannot properly arise in a court of justice whether he is a heathen or a Christian. The point is whether or not he is guilty of the crime charged, and the court has no more right to discriminate against the Jew than against the Christian, or, as is too often the case in our land, in favor of Masonry. The State deals with trangressors of the law, whoever they may be and of what religion the criminal is has nothing to do with the matter and is, in fact, none of the government's business. If laws are enacted which make it the business of courts to inquire into such matters and discriminate and decide accordingly, they are intolerent governments and persecution is the result. But when the Church insists on the law of the Lord as declared in Holy Scriptures and accordingly refuses to fellowship with Jews and Mohammedans, the case is different. It cannot do otherwise, for its very existence is dependent on its allegiance to the Lord as He rules among His people by His Word. It is one of the simplest of all propositions that in the kingdom of Christ He alone must rule, and accordingly no man or association of men can have authority to change one jot or little of the Word which He has given and which abideth forever. How could the Church do otherwise than maintain the authority of its Lord, and receive whom He receives and reject whom eH rejects? If the term intolerance in such a case is applied to the Church that abides by the Word of its Lord, true Christians can only pronounce such intolerance a shining virtue, though they deplore the misleading application of the term.

Organizations that call themselves churches are often so liberal in their reception and retention of members that they lay special claim to the epithet tolerant, as against other churches that do not assert so large a liberality, but still in some respects adhere to the Lord's Word as authoritative and decisive. The difference between these churches is simply one of degree in departure from divine authority, not of principle, so long as any departure is recognized as allowable. Some churches open their doors so wide that Jews and Gentiles may come in, if they will only conform to the law of right as the natural conscience demands it; others will draw the line at Jews and Mohammedans; still others will scruple at fellowship with Socinians and all the varieties of sects which deny the divinity of Christ and reject the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. As the term is so often used, such religious societies, some of which have no legitimate claim even to be classified as churches, are called tolerant, and the degree of their tolerance is measured by the extent of their departure from Christianity. The less the law of the Lord, who alone has authority in the Church, is maintained as necessary to membership and to good standing in their association, the more they are extolled by some for their large-hearted liberality and tolerance. But those who look upon the subject in the light of divine revelation, and therefore apply the truth which nature does not furnish, readily perceive that here the question is not one between the greater or less manifestation of the power of Christian love, or of Christianity at all, but one between the two principles of grace and nature. A so-called church that yields everything which our Savior has given His disciples to hold fast until He comes, will seem laudably liberal and admirable in its tolerance, whilst the true Church, which insists on observing all things which the Lord has taught, must seem extremely intolerant.

It is obvious that only confusion and wrong can arise when terms which are applicable to one divine institution are promiscuously applied to another whose nature and purpose is different. The Lutheran Church, which has always

taught tolerance and still teaches it, though its cry is still to a great extent a voice in the wilderness, has often been branded as an intolerant Church. Considering the confused use of the term where it is entirely irrelevant, it is easy to see why this wrong is done. On the same ground it is manifest to eyes which see clearly, that religious denominations are often lauded as eminently tolerant, though they would, if they had the power, destroy the Lutheran Church, because of its firm adherence to the Holy Scriptures and consequent refusal to recognize such so-called tolerance, which sets aside the Word of God and sets up benighted reason in the church as the rule and norm of judgment in its stead. Churches that refuse to be bound by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, and arrogate to themselves the right to judge for themselves which words of the Lord are to be regarded as obligatory and from which they may dispense applicants for membership in His kingdom, can gain the glory of tolerance without much trouble and without any sacrifice. Such glory is cheap, for it accords with the will of the flesh. Those who follow the multitude in disregarding the stern demands of Holy Scripture and assert their freedom from the supposed bondage of the Bible and of the Church that maintains the Bible's supremacy, can well afford to tolerate anything and everything that makes pretense to religion, but are usually ready to persecure the Church of the Living God, which declines fellowship with those who deny the Lord Jesus and His infallible and unchangeable Word as recorded in the Scriptures. That Word stands unchangeable in all the changes of time, and those who believe it can make no concessions to the changing thoughts and theories of men. When the word tolerance or intolerance is applied to the Church, which is the congregation of those who believe, it cannot without introducing confusion and resulting in injury be used in the same sense in which it is applied to the State. The latter is intolerant when on religious grounds it denies rights which belong to men by nature, whatever their religion may be; the former can be intolerant only when it presumes to add to the un-

alterable truth of the Bible and exercises discipline which the Lord does not recognize as to persecution by visiting temporal punishment on those who refuse to conform to ecclesiastical demands made upon them, that would be possible only so far as the Romish theory of supreme temporal as well as spiritual power is accorded to the Church as a theory that is subversive of both Church and State. The papal usurpation of all power in heaven and on earth can consistently persecute, and has persecuted, and will persecute wherever it obtains the opportunity, but it is only because of its anti-Christian usurpation. The Lutheran Church never could without being untrue to its principle. Those who charge her with intolerance because of her unswerving adherence to her Master's Word, know not what they do, unless they mean to overthrow the Kingdom which is not of this world.

It is a blessing that in our land Church and State are not united, and that each can do its work in its own way, without the one's being hampered by the other. But it is of the highest importance that the grounds of such separation be fully recognized and that all efforts to mingle the powers of one with those of the other be firmly resisted. The confusion can only result in mischief, leading to tyrannical burdening of human conscience and to persecution on religious grounds.

The reason why Rome seeks temporal power is plain. She desires to uphold her hierarchical system by force, if this cannot be done by argument. Claiming to be vested with all power on earth, she claims the prerogative of ruling over all men and all institutions of God's among men. The power committed to the State as well as that committed to the Church she assumes to be hers. On this assumption it does not seem so unreasonable that she should persecute those who will not bow to her authority, in matetrs of religion. She urges rightly, that the soul and its eternal interests are of higher import than the body and its temporal welfare. The conclusion then looks plausible, that if physical force and corporal punishments are right in re-

gard to the outward life for the protection of communities in the exercise of common rights, it must be unquestionably right to employ such means to compass man's eternal salvation, and therefore to kill the obstinate heretics in order to save others from the infection of heresy, and thus to promote the greater glory of God. The papal Church has a plausible case if once its usurpation of supreme power is conceded. But that is its Anti-Christian falsehood, and those who so far forget or neglect the gospel as to accept the strong delusion are readily caught in its toils. One of the great abominations of popery it its presumptuous claims to be at once Church and State, and therefore to have all the powers which God has given to each. Hence where popery reigns there can be no religious liberty, and all dissent from its pretendedly infallible decisions it must treat as the State must treat a crime. Religious persecution is thus evitable. It is but the consistent application of Romish doctrine, and with regard to Romanism it is certainly true that it ceases to persecute only where it fails in ability to carry out its principles. It is not content with rejecting what it pronounces heresy and excommunicating the heretics, which is a right that must be conceded to it as a church; but it arrogates to itself the authority to inflict temporal penalties upon them and even to kill them, which is a right that in any event could belong only to the State and which by divine ordinance not even the civil government can do for alleged religious errors. The Romish usurpation with its principle of enslaving consciences and persecuting those who decline submission to its decrees is subversive of Church and State, and the sooner our American people see the danger which it threatens, the better it will be for the prosperity of our churches and the preservation of our liberties.

Our Lutheran Church, which adheres strictly to the truth of the gospel as brought to light anew by the great reformer and set forth in the Lutheran Confession, claims no power of making laws and binding them upon the consciences of men and no right to exericse the functions of

the civil government and in consequence to inflict corporal punishment or torture to death those who refuse the truth unto salvation which she declares. She will not by the application of physical force or the menace of temporal penalties endeavor to build the Church; that is persecution which is entirely foreign to her nature and calling. She rejoices in the possession of means by which the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is brought to men for the salvation of their souls, and her work and her glory is to ply these means in furtherence of the Savior's purpose to save poor sinners from the everlasting death which is the doom of sin. She will not have religious fellowship with people who refuse to confess Him and His Word, and thus decline to recognize the King in the kingdom which is not of this world, in which all their interests and all their hope and comfort lie. She is not one and will not pretend to be one with any who will not bow to the will of the Lord who alone can save. How pitiful it is that men in their blindness call this intolerance and persecution like that of Rome which she abominates.

THE DIVISION OF THE DECALOGUE.*

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

I. *The Facts to be Considered.* The decalogue is found in two recensions, one in Exodus 20, 1-17, and the other in Deut. 5, 6-21. The two forms do not agree throughout. The first difference is found in the third commandment, where the Exodus text begins with זכור "Remember," and the Deuteronomy text with the word שמור "Observe." Then in the elaboration of this commandment, Exodus, after the word "manservant," adds yet: "nor thy cattle," while Deuteronomy reads also: " nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle;" and after the words:

* A Conference paper, to be supplemented by another dealing especially with the difference between the ninth and tenth commandments.

"the stranger that is within thy gates," adds also the words: "that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." Exodus gives the fundamental motive for the observance of the Sabbath in these words: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." These words are not found in Deuteronomy, but the motive is given in this language: "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commandeth thee to keep the Sabbath." The two recensions accordingly assign two different reasons for the observance of this day. In the fourth commandment Deuteronomy adds, after the words: "that thy days may be long," the further statement: "And that it may go well with thee." The difference in the English rendering does not always point to a difference in the original. In Exodus the fifth commandment reads: "Thou shalt not kill," and in Deuteronomy we read: "Thou shalt do no murder." In the Hebrew the same verb is used in both cases. The word "neither," with which the translation of this and of the following commandments begin on Deuteronomy is based on the conjunction *waw* being placed before the negative, but which is lacking in Exodus. The most interesting difference is found in the ninth and tenth commandments. According to Exodus the ninth reads: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors *house*," but the same commandment in Denteronomy reads: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors *wife*," while "house" belongs to the tenth commandment according to the Exodus text. Our Lutheran catechism has accordingly followed the Exodus recension. In addition Deuteronomy adds to the tenth commandment, before the word "manservant," the word "field." In Exodus both the ninth and the tenth commandments have the same verb for "covet," viz: חמד while in Deuteronomy this verb is used only of the ninth referring to "wife," while the coveting for all of the other objects is ex-

pressed by the verb התאוה This condition of affairs is reflected in the English translation of Deuteronomy, where the first verb is translated by "covet," and the second by "desire." These two verbs are probably as nearly synonymous as any that can be found. The Septuagint renders them both by ἐπιζητέω the common verb for "desire," which can be used both *in malam partem* and *in bonam partem,* the meaning to be decided by the connection. It is interesting to note that the Septuagint in both recensions of the Decalogue makes the ninth commandment to read: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's *wife.*" A consultation of such works as Gesenius' Heb. Dictionary, both the smaller and the Thesaurus, of the Stade-Seigfried Lexicon, of Fürst, and especially Cremer and of the latest Hebrew dictionary, the immense work of Driver, Briggs and Brown, has failed to indicate any more than possibly a slight difference in the shade of meaning between these two words used for "coveting," and this difference would make the word התאוה in the tenth commandment somewhat stronger than the word in the ninth.

II. *Examination of Data.* The two texts in Exodus and Deuteronomy agree in this that there are to be "ten words," or commandments, but do not indicate how the distribution is to take place. Three divisions have been proposed, of which the following is a bird's eye view:

	Greek and Reformed.	*Rom. Cath. and Lutheran.*	*Jewish.*
God the Deliverer out of Egypt	Preface	Preface	Com. I
Prohibition of Polygamy	Com. I	Com. I	Com. II
Prohibition of Graven Images	Com. II		
	Com. III-IX	Com. II-VIII	Com. III-IX
Prohibition of Covetousness	Com. X	Com. IX Com. X	Com. X

The second method is also called the Augustinian, having the special approval of Augustine in his Commentary on Exodus. On the other hand, the Reformed and the Greek division can appeal to Philo and Josephus of the New Testament and the Apostolic eras, and especially to Origen in his twelfth Homily on Exodus; and, we may add, is favored by the majority of modern critics, among them such representatives of modern Lutheranism in Germany as Oehler and Delitzsch, and by such authorities as Ewald, Dillmann, Nestle, and many others. The so-called Jewish division here given is found in the Talmud, but has never found any acceptance in the Christian church, especially because the Introduction, which is no commandment at all, is made the first. Augustine especially declares, however, that his division is based on Jewish precedent; and some few things in the Masoretic text go to show that these Jewish text critics favored this division, whatever the original arrangement may have been. In neither of the two recensions are the first and the second commandments kept apart by the sign of separation, the Hebrew letter ***Samech,*** which is found between all of the other commandments in both books. It may be added that in the Exodus text the second is separated from the third commandment by the larger sign of separation, the letter *Pe*. Keil, the most conservative commentator on the Old Testament, says that these Jewish scholars "seem" thereby to favor the Roman Catholic and Lutheran division; but there is no certainty in the matter. Another feature, however, that favors the division of our church is the accentuation in the Hebrew text. This is here of a two-fold character, one giving the ordinary accents and the other special rythmic accents. This latter system points to a connection between the two commandments directed against idolatry and the making of graven images, but separates the ninth and the tenth. It would seem then that among the Jews there were two systems in vogue, that adopted by the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran churches, based at least in part on the Talmud and the Masoretic text, and, secondly, the Reformed and the Greek division,

based on Philo and Josephus. Those who reject our division do it largely on the ground that it ignores altogether the commandment against the making of graven images, something that would be considered an impossibility when it is remembered that these commandments constitute the *corpus juris* of the Jewish state and church. Nor can these two commandments be considered one, as the sin of polytheism and the sin of making graven images are quite distinct, as is readily seen from the story of the golden calf and the false altars erected by Jeroboam after the division of the Kingdom. A further reason for this is this, that a real difference between the coveting meant in the ninth commandment and the coveting meant in the tenth cannot be demonstrated. Delitzsch in Herzog's Real Encyclopaedia, Ed. II, Vol. III, p. 530, says: "The distinction made by the dogmaticians between the coveting of the ninth and that of the tenth, the former to mean the '*concupiscentia actualis*' and the latter the '*concupiscentia originals*' is without foundation." It must always be remembered that in the original Exodus text the same and not a different verb is used throughout, and only in the somewhat free reproduction in Deuteronomy are two different verbs employed. The ignoring of the commandment against graven images in our division is certainly a weakness, and the failure to point out any *real* difference between the character of the sin condemned by the ninth and that condemned by the tenth does not add any strength. Indeed if there were any material difference between the two words for "coveting," more than that found between two ordinary synonyms, then we would have two and not one tenth commandment, since this commandment in Exodus has one verb and in Deuteronomy has another. The hermeneutical principle of the *Analogy of the Scriptures* will not permit us to accept an essential difference. It would seem therefore that there is a "stand off" in reference to the original division of the ten commandments. Tradition evidently largely, though not exclusively, favors the Roman Catholic and Lutheran division, but internal evidences the Reformed and Greek. It is inter-

esting in this connection to note that those who are the special protagonists of the Augustinian division often defend it with a certain proviso. Augustine himself holds to the text of Deuteronomy, feeling evidently that if any object mentioned in the last two commandments deserves the dignity of a special commandment it is the "wife;" and Kurtz, the chief defender of our division in modern times, amends the text of Exodus by the aid of Deuteronomy. This is also the Roman Catholic plan. It may yet be added that seemingly the Jews regarded neither the original division of the Ten Words nor their order as a matter of special importance. The sequence found in the Hebrew texts is disturbed by the Septuagint translation, where the commandments that bear on the life of the family, the 4th and the 6th, are brought together and the fifth becomes the seventh. In the New Testament the order is variable, but usually the sixth precedes the fifth, cf. Mark, 10, 19, Rom. 13, 9.

III. It is quite a different question whether for pædagogical reasons or practical advantages the Lutheran is not decidedly the better of the two. Indeed on this subject there can scarcely be any doubt, as the commandment against graven images as distinct from the commandment against the worship of false gods has, for our times, lost its significance; and, on the other hand, the ninth and the tenth commandments furnish ample materials for extensive treatment. A series of different treatments in catechetical instruction between the two commandments is furnished by Palmer in his *Evangelische Katechetik,* p. 301 sq. of the 4th edition of 1856.

THE QUESTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN OUR SYNOD.

BY PROFESSOR CARL ACKERMAN, Ph. D., LIMA, OHIO.

The presentation at the request of Joint Synod of "Overtures" from the "Lima Lutheran Educational Association" looking to the transfer of Lima College to Synod has called forth again a discussion of the educational problem in our

midst in so far as it concerns the higher education of our people. As in the past so now there are some differences of opinion as to our duties in this direction. All are agreed that for the preparation of pastors and teachers to do the direct work of the church we have need of institutions of learning — not simply seminaries but colleges in which an education in the liberal arts may be given as a preparation for seminary work. Our synod has a call to preach the gospel and her mission field has so widened that she must educate men and equip them well to go out and do this work. She has therefore not only had her seminary for three-quarters of a century, but also for a period of over fifty years her college, the chief object and glory of which has been the education of young men for the Gospel. ministry.

So far I say there is universal agreement. But when the question is widened and inquiry is made as to whether the church has a farther duty, whether she has a duty, to furnish higher education outside of the number of those who are preparing for the ministry, some of us answer yes, and some answer no. The writer recognizes the fact that this question is before us now in a practical form and ought to be discussed. Shall our synod continue to confine herself to the education of ministers or has she a call to furnish higher Christian education for those who desire to enter other callings? Or shall she as in the past hand this work over to the institutions of other churches or of the state? These are the problems that confront us.

In favor of a continuance of our present course, it is urged that it is the call of the church to preach the Gospel and make disciples of the nations and this only, and that this does not include the work of higher Christian education for secular callings. Let us take up a few observations with regard to this subject. The two great truths upon which the Reformation was fought, man is justified by faith alone, and the Bible is the only rule of faith and life, made the establishment of schools a necessity. Luther

and his co-workers recognized this fact and labored very earnestly to this end. In his writings, he discusses almost every phase of the educational question and elaborates a system which begins with the primary school and ends in the university. His ideal of education was to develop a Christian man fitted by his educational work to discharge the duties of every relation of life. He recognizes the necessity of a good thorough education for those who should preach the Gospel, but he combats again and again the idea prevalent then and not yet dead that for the secular callings we need no education save that which gives the necessary intellectual qualifications for the performance of the duties of the office which each individual holds. In opposition to this view he holds always that the training for secular callings must be under Christian influences from primary school to university. After picturing the immoral and unchristian conditions that existed at the universities, he said: "I should prefer, it is true, that our youth be ignorant and dumb rather than that the universities and convents should remain as the only sources of instruction open to them. For it is my earnest intention, prayer and desire that these schools of satan either be destroyed or changed into Christian schools. But since God has so richly favored us, and given us a great number of persons who are competent thoroughly to instruct and train our young people, it is truly needful that we should not disregard his grace and let him knock in vain. He stands at the door; happy are we if we open to him. He calls us; happy is the man who answers him. If we disregard his call, so that he passes by, who will bring him back." Later on he says: "So much for the utility and necessity of Christian schools for our spiritual interests and the salvation of the soul. Let us now consider the body and inquire: though there were no soul, nor heaven, nor hell, but only civil government, would not this require good schools and learned men more than do our spiritual interests? Hitherto the Papists have taken no interest in civil government, and have conducted the schools so entirely in the interests of the

priesthood that it has become a matter of reproach for a learned man to marry, and he has been forced to hear remarks like this: 'Behold he has become a man of the world and cares nothing for the clerical state,' just as if the priestly order were alone acceptable to God, and the secular classes, as they are called, belonged to Satan, and were unchristian. But in the sight of God, the former rather belong to Satan, while the despised masses (as happened to the people of Israel in the Babylonian captivity) remain in the land and in right relations with God.

"It is not necessary to say here that civil government is a divine institution; of that I have elsewhere said so much, that I hope no one has any doubts on the subject. The question is, how are we to get able and skilled rulers? And here we are put to shame by the heathen, who in ancient times, especially the Greeks and Romans, without knowing that civil government is a divine ordinance, yet instructed the boys and girls with such earnestness and industry that, when I think of it, I am ashamed of Christians, and especially of our Germans, who are such blockheads and brutes that they can say: 'Pray what is the use of schools, if one is not to become a priest? Yet we know, or ought to know, how necessary and useful a thing it is, and how acceptable to God, when a prince, lord, counsellor, or other ruler, is well-trained and skillful in discharging, in a Christian way, the functions of his office." The two great ends always prominent in Luther's mind for the maintenance of schools both elementary and higher were the needs of the church and the needs of the state. Whatever he wrote on the subject of education can be grouped around these two ideas. Considering the first as perhaps the more important, he nevertheless emphasized again and again the necessity of Christian education for the secular callings of life. Of this the above quotations furnish abundant proof and these quotations might be multiplied. "Luther sought the establishment of primary schools for the instruction of the masses, that they might better discharge their domestic, religious and social duties; he urged the necessity of second-

ary schools for those who were to pursue professional careers in Church and State; he defended the higher education of the universities, where the final preparation for learned vocations was to be obtained." And of a school in either field in which the instruction is not Christian or thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christ he knows nothing. His noble ideal of education was as I said before a Christian man fitted through instruction and discipline to discharge the duties of every relation of life.

Has the Lutheran church continued to labor in this spirit since the days of the Reformation? Go with me if you will to the lands in which Lutheranism has been and is the ruling spirit and examine the results in the field of education. Go where we will and we will find that she has not only cradled the child in the lap of the Christian school, but that she has poured out to the youth and to the man of the fountains of wisdom and the depths of knowledge always from Christian vessels. Wherever her doctrine and church life was purest, she has exemplified in her work that she believes in all her educational work in that principle of true education: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." I need not discuss this subject any farther. All educational history recognizes the facts here but mentioned.

As a result of this policy, the work of education in which she has engaged has been a powerful factor in the education and affairs of men in general. Her universities have guided the realms of thought these three hundred years. Well has Dr. Seiss said of Germany, (and he might have said the same of other lands): "Her universities have been the pride of Germany for the last three hundred years, her critics and religious teachers have been the leading instructors of Christendom from the days of Luther until now. Take from the religious literature of the nations all that has been, directly or indirectly, derived from Lutheran divines and the ecclesiastical heaven would be bereft of most of its stars. Strike out the long list of Lutheran names and writings, in whatever department,

which each of the past three centuries has furnished, and a void would be made for which all the ages could produce no adequate compensation."

What now are we going to do in this same field? That the higher education of our laity is a necessity in the present age, especially if we hope as a church to make our influence felt in this western world, I believe all must concede. Is this work to be done by the state, by other churches, by private enterprise, or by our own church? That it cannot be satisfactorily done by the state, that is that the education offered by our State colleges and universities cannot satisfy the consciousness of a Lutheran Christian, I believe again all must concede. Experience has at least taught us that our boys and girls so educated have generally lost the Lutheran spirit, have grown cold in the service of the church, and have either gone over to some so-called liberal church or what is even worse, have landed in infidelity. Again, I believe that a Lutheran Christian must say that it cannot be satisfactorily done by the schools of other churches. Education here will again result in losses to the Lutheran church. Either the student will return filled with ideas, "newfangled" ideas, which he feels called upon to advocate and promulgate, often to the detriment or distraction of the home congregation; or he has outgrown altogether his Lutheran garb and sports the garb of some other denomination. What a story the record of these cases in the congregations of our own synod would make! What trials and tribulations have they not prepared for our pastors! What heartaches for parents!

Private enterprise if conducted in the spirit of the church can do the work. Its educational work if conducted by Lutheran teachers could be carried on to the upbuilding of our Lutheran Zion just as well perhaps as if carried on directly by the church itself. And yet for two reasons, at least, I would say, private enterprise cannot accomplish the work as well as the church directly. First, private enterprise is to a greater or less extent not under church control, and therefore the church has no assurance that the

work will always be done as she desires. Secondly, any higher education worthy of the name is not self-supporting, and hence private enterprise must either be heavily endowed or have some definite field from which to derive its necessary revenues. For the present at least, we cannot hope for large endowments in our Synod. Hence it is my conviction that private enterprise will not solve the problem in our midst. There remains therefore but one practicable field to carry on this work, that the church do it if it is to be done. Has she a call to do it? For myself I answer yes. I am sure also that in this answer I voice the firm conviction of a large number of our pastors and intelligent laity—a conviction too which has not been hastily reached, but after the maturest consideration. I believe it is a duty imposed upon the church by the Master—a duty which she dare not shift upon others, but which she must perform with all zeal and faithfulness.

I have already said that if the Lutheran church is to make her influence felt in this western world she must take part in the higher education of the laity. What are the conditions that meet us here? The educational work in colleges and universities has been almost totally in the hands of other denominations, of the state, or of private colleges, heavily endowed, often bearing the Christian name but filled with the rationalistic spirit of the higher criticism and its allies. In the leading colleges and universities of our land the incumbents of the professorial chairs are free to pursue their course of work as they please and many have landed in a philosophy that is far from the teachings of the Word. Is it any wonder then that there is a secularization of everything almost in church and state? Is it any wonder that the work of higher education is being secularized more and more in all of our states? Is it any wonder that the church must fight harder and harder from year to year this growing tendency? Luther calls attention to the necessity of earnest Christian men in the offices of the state in his day. Is there any less necessity to-day.

The very form of government under which we live lends emphasis to that necessity. The future of a republic depends more on the character of its citizens than is the case in a monarchy. Another has well said, "A democracy without righteousness is as much more formidable than a royal despotism than a million tyrants are more terrible than one." We see the results of a lack of character and moral stamina every now and then in the governmental frauds that are unearthed. These are finger-boards which point out the way whither we are going. If we expect to maintain the integrity, honesty, and morality of our people, it can only be by a system of ethics which is based on the noble principles of Christianity.

Statistics prove that about eighty per cent. of those who occupy positions of trust and are leaders in the land are college-bred men. If the young men who are to be leaders in the future are to be trained to such principles of morality and religion as we consider necessary, it must be that our schools and colleges do the work. The influence of godly rulers will not fail to manifest itself in the morals of their subjects. Show me a body of rulers in whom Christian principles predominate and I will in return generally be able to show you a people who respect law, regard rights, and do not abuse their liberty,—a people that will solve its difficulties in the precepts and practices of the Christian religion. I hope that I may not be understood as pleading simply for worldly greatness. That should not be our aim at all in urging the necessity of lay education under the control of the church. And yet Christians are to be the salt of the earth and are to be lights also. The example of the Scriptures and the teachings of many of the great in the church certainly do not say to us that Christians are not to occupy positions of trust in the state. Luther speaks with no uncertain sound on this point.

Granting, however, that positions of trust should fall beyond our pale of consideration, has the church no duty in the higher education of our boys and girls? They will go to college and large numbers of them, too. It has been so

in the past, it will be so in greater measure in the future. Shall we look after their wants or will they be pushed out to look for their education elsewhere? Is the church justified in neglecting the establishment of colleges for this purpose, and thus making it practically necessary for our young people to seek their training in institutions in which they are often in danger of making shipwreck of their faith? The writer confesses that if she is, then much of his life and that of thousands and tens of thousands of others has been wasted and thousands and millions of dollars have been squandered these hundreds of years in a work which its promoters have looked upon as divine. If the church has no call to do this work, then all this labor and worry and expense is of no avail and the whole matter might as well be given over into the hands of the state for the support of whose institutions we are all contributing. If it is simply a work in which the church may engage if she desires but in which she has no duty, then surely there is no room for the Christian college in any field save in the preparation of men for the pastorate and school. But I am certainly far from acknowledging this. Our boys and girls will seek a higher education and we certainly would not deter them from it. The Lord has given them minds to develop, and if they desire to develop them, certainly we should give them every encouragement, and just this is primarily the work of the college. It is its duty to draw out the faculties of the student and to draw them out in due proportions in order that the individual may stand out a complete and well-rounded man or woman. For such a purpose it is established, for such a purpose it is maintained. In that development the principles which must guide in all teaching are the fundamental principles of Christianity.

It is the special joy but also the special responsibility of the college to have the youth in the years when the mind is ripening and character is taking permanent shape. I say it is the joy of the college, for it is a pleasure to see the mind grow under the sunshine scattered abroad from its walls and under the refreshing showers of its learning; but it is

also a special responsibility, for mind and character once formed and ripened, it may be for good or it may be for evil, is practically fixed for life. It is the joy of the Christian college to know that through it Christian culture is brought to bear upon men and women entering the most varied callings of life, and that thereby these young men and women are destined to leaven all classes and grades of society; but it is also its special responsibility so to make its light to shine as to glorify the name of God in the hearts and lives of those who bask beneath its beneficent rays. We owe it to our young people to furnish them just such conditions, so that they may not simply gain intellectual culture as a preparation for life, but that they may be kept in the faith and saved for usefulness in the church while following their earthly callings. It would be possible for me to mention a large number of cases of young men and women, among the brightest, who have gone from our congregations to other colleges and have been totally lost to the church and in a number of instances to Christianity as a whole.

The kind of education we want for our young people and which our country needs is that which is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Bible. The very fact that our leading educational institutions have so generally gone off into rationalism and philosophy and science falsely so-called, makes it necessary that we offer the antidote. It may be that such colleges will not be popular with some, but we must have them anyway and should so man and equip them that they will hold our young people. Charity compels me to believe that our young people do desire to be guided by the landmarks of revealed truth, while they desire to enter the broad fields of science, arts, literature, and philosophy we need have no fears there. If their teachers are decided in their faith and love to teach it (and no Lutheran teacher should be aught else), why can they not be kept within the bounds of revealed truth? God's book of nature and Book of Revelation do not speak in discordant notes. Why should there be any fear to investigate this field? Bacon says: "It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to athe-

ism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate, and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." No; for safety we must teach the arts and sciences and literature and philosophy along the lines of revealed truth. The church has the duty to enter upon and prosecute the work of higher lay education.

The church should then labor to equip our existing institutions for wider spheres, and establish new ones wherever needed to meet her wants in this direction. Her pastors and people should labor energetically not only for a greater supply of pastors but for the education of her young men and women for the secular callings. Doing this the church is also doing missionary work, for she will rear up for herself men and women who will be not only a source of strength in the home congregation, but who will most heartily and vigorously support her enterprises, most liberally patronize and maintain her institutions of learning, and push forward her missionary work. It is to our educated laymen that the church must look for counsel and support when most needed. They are het mosr successful workers in the cause of Christ.

The church should labor in the cause of higher lay education, also because, as Luther says, she has a responsibility of raising up Christian statesmen and men of affairs that her people may do their part in the conduct of the affairs of our beloved land. When men in public life declare it as their creed that the decalogue has no place in politics, it is time that the leaven of Lutheranism and Lutheran loyalty to the principles of true government are making themselves felt, lest the glorious heritage of liberty, civil and religious, be lost to us. We can only make them felt with an educated laity, firmly grounded in Lutheran principles. "It is and remains a fact not to be gainsaid, that on the Lutheran church is resting the obligation to furnish her quota of Christian men to the ranks of those who are called

to lead and to command in all movements and measures that have for their object the intellectual and moral improvement of the American people, their personal and national well-being. We may labor ever so diligently within the sphere of our own church, to advance intelligence, promote religion, alleviate suffering, and spread and enhance happiness; and in doing so, we may make ever so many sacrifices, and submit to ever so many self-denials; yet we are chargeable with neglect of duty until we become alive to the subject of Christian Lay Education, and use our best endeavors, and exert our most vigorous energies, for its promotion, its extension, and its perpetuation."

THE BELIEVER'S FINAL ACQUITTAL.

(Sermon by Rev. J. Sheatsley, A. M., Delaware, O., delivered at the late convention of the English district at Circleville, O.)

Matt. 25, 31-40.

When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth *his* sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed *thee?* or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee?* Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

In Christ Jesus, beloved people:

In spite of those who say that there is no God, that the earth was not created, but was its own creator and that there can therefore be no judgment day; in spite of those who say that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God and that

He can have no authority to judge the world; in spite too of the revellers in the flesh who make light of the Word of God and mockingly ask, "Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation;" in spite of all these evasions and all this fencing on the part of guilty minds, the day is nevertheless coming when all nations shall be gathered before the judgment seat of the Christ King and He shall separate them one from another as the shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats. Then and there shall be pronounced the believing sinner's final acquittal.

That acquittal should be a matter of great concern to us. A prisoner charged with some serious crime is much, concerned about his possible acquittal. He wants to know just what can be done on his part to insure a favorable trial at court. He employs an attorney and no stone is left unturned to show that he is innocent of the charge, or else that he deserves to be acquitted. We are accused of crimes sufficient to condemn us to everlasting separation from God in His kingdom, and to perpetual fellowship with the devil and his angels. If now there is a possibility of acquittal from that charge, a possibility of being owned again of God as His children, holy and well-beloved, a possibility therefore of escaping the torments of hell and of entering into the joys of our Lord, then, I say, we should want to know the nature of that acquittal, upon what condition it shall be pronounced, what characteristics must mark those in whose favor it shall be granted, and what we can do to secure it. If an artist is engaged to paint a portrait for some royal person, he will need the model. To reproduce that model in outline, color and expression will be his object and upon fidelity in this will depend the royal acceptation of the painting. So our Lord and King asks a living portrait from each of us, a life of grace and beauty, a life of faith and love, which, on the one hand, has laid hold upon all the divine gifts of grace and salvation and, on the other, has consecrated all its powers to the service of Christ and to

holy living; and when on that day He shall behold in us such a life, then shall He acquit us of all sin and damning charges. To attain to that pattern, to fill in the outlines of that life so as to meet with the approbation of our divine King, that must be the great object of every one who would save his soul alive.

In studying the believer's final acquittal at the last day we note, first, that on the basis of our text

THE ACQUITTAL SHALL BE PRONOUNCED ACCORDING TO THE LAW OF WORKS.

This statement may sound somewhat strange to Lutheran ears, it may even sound unorthodox, for we are so accustomed to connect our salvation directly with the act of justification through faith that we are very much inclined to brand as work-righteousness any conception which in some way makes our salvation depend upon life or works. We start with faith, the beginning of the sinner's hope, but are apt, with one great bound, to seize upon the final and completed salvation of the perfected kingdom, without considering sufficiently what lies between these extremes. But our Savior here, in His wonderful though simple description of the process of judgment, gives us to understand what lies between the beginning and the end of the believer's earthly life. He makes it as plain as He, the plainest of all teachers, could make it that between the beginning and the end of the believer's course there is a life of works, a life of service, and that He is going to judge us according to those works. Indeed, He makes it to appear in the text that this will be the only question asked, what have you done? "I was a hungered, and ye gave Me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave Me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took Me in: naked and ye clothed Me: I was sick, and ye visited Me: I was in prison, and ye came unto Me." Not a word in the entire description of the judgment scene do we hear about faith, about forgiveness of sin, or about justification. It is all works; this have you done, that have

you done; and in the case of the wicked: this have you not done, that have you not done. We are made to tremble for our highly cherished doctrine of justification by grace through faith without the deeds of the law; and whenever we have occasion to preach on the Gospel lesson from which our text is taken we are apt to feel ourselves specially called to show that it does not teach salvation by works and that we are saved through faith. That this text does not teach salvation by works without faith we believe, but to make such a negative message to any great extent the burden of a sermon on this text is to misapply Scripture and largely to defeat the very purpose for which our Savior uttered these words. If in this connection He wanted to instruct us on the doctrine of Justification by Faith and that the inheritance of life depended solely upon that in every sense of the word, then why did He not so state the case? Why did He not say, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom, for ye have believed upon Me and through faith have forgiveness of sins and righteousness before God? Is it not clear that His object here was to lay special stress upon the need of works, the need of service, in the believer's life? And consider, too, that to do this He chose the most solemn moment, fraught with the greatest consequences, in the believer's whole existence: He himself appears in glory, not in the humble form of a servant, but as the mighty King and Lord; He has taken His position upon the throne of His glory and of His Father, around Him are gathered all the hosts of holy angels as His swift messengers; before Him are assembled all nations of the earth: here amidst these surroundings of heavenly glory, power and awful sublimity He tells us what our life, our service, must be in order that we may receive the welcome, "Come, ye blessed of My Father."

Faithful therefore to our Savior's purpose here we likewise lay stress upon works, upon service in the Christian's life. We must emphasize the need of doctrine, the need of faith, of forgiveness of sins alone by the grace of God, of justification, of baptism, of the Lord's supper and of what-

ever else is essential to a full and sound faith, but it will prove fatal to our eternal hopes, if service is lacking. From the thief upon the cross to whom only a moment was left for preparation to meet his God, nothing more could be expected than that he repent and believe upon the Lord, though even here also was the beginning of that new life which, if the penitent malefactor had been permitted to live, would afterwards have manifested itself in loving service to Christ and fellowmen. But to you and me who by the grace of God were called to be children of the highest already in childhood by baptism, or even if later in life, and who have many years of service before us—to us has He said, Go, work in my vineyard, or as St. Paul, the champion of justification by faith, puts it, "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling."

And not only here, but frequently elsewhere, does our Savior emphasize the importance of a life of service. One morning He with His disciples was on His way to the temple; in the distance He saw a fig tree with rich foliage, promising fruit, for He was an hungered; but on coming near He found no fruit thereon. Instantly indignation and divine wrath were kindled and found vent in the withering curse, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever. And presently the fig-tree withered away." A fit emblem, this tree, of the Jewish people who possessed all the ordinances of salvation and professed to be God's chosen people, but who brought forth no fruit to the Lord's glory; a divinely intended emblem too, this tree, of every professing Christian who is barren of consecrated service to his Master. Again, our Savior in the Sermon on the Mount lays down the golden rule of service, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" and to this He adds the significant words, "for this is the law and the prophets." One day, too, a lawyer came to Jesus and temptingly asked Him, Master, which is the great commandment? You know Jesus' reply: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great

commandment, but the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And then He adds, "On these two commandments hang *all* the law and the prophets." Jesus here sums up as to purpose the totality of divine revelation and shows that the aim is service, loving service to man and God. Or as St. Paul expresses it, " In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love."

Faith is necessary to start with, fogiveness of sins is necessary, justification, imputed righteousness are necessary; and they are necessary not only to start with but we must hold fast to them unto the end; but in this justified state of the sinner, Christ demands service; and it is this service which can be seen and known, just like the tree is known by its fruit, that shall eventually determine the possibility of the sinner's final acquittal. However, a nominal Christian may attire himself with professions and religious formalisms, he is but a foliaged fig-tree without fruit and stands exposed to the divine curse. Religion is more than confession, more than profession; religion is life. A faith that lodges only in the brain and does not reach the heart, the very reins of man, to move him to holy service, is the dead faith that saves no one. Why say ye, Lord, Lord, but do not my words, shall be the King's fearful rebuke. Religion is life, and, as one has well said, " The only way one can get any good out of religion is by living it." Religion is life; " I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Life furthermore is activity, and religious life is activity in full communion with God and in His service. "My father worketh hitherto, and I work," said Jesus. We need to follow His example.

But we need to note furthermore that the service which Christ demands consists in works of love and mercy. Not any kind of work will meet the divine requirement; not the works of an empire builder, not the works of one who has reared great monuments to his own earthly glory or to human skill and ingenuity; not the works necessarily of

the great writer, artist, inventor, or discoverer; but works of love and mercy: "I was a hungered, and ye gave Me meat;" etc. Here is the standard of all divinely acceptable service, the mark by which it is known and distinguished from all service that finds its reward in this life. It is of course clear that such service is not limited in its activities to the forms mentioned in the text. There are many ways in which we can feed, clothe and otherwise minister unto our fellowmen, both in temporal and in spiritual things. The manner in which we do this depends largely upon surroundings, one's calling, talents and opportunities. But we have here the characteristic mark of the service which must be the object of our lives so far as our fellowmen are concerned. There is no other purpose worth living for except to do good; even as it is said of Jesus that He went about doing good. That was indeed the very purpose of His coming into the world; He was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil and so deliver us from his power and from the curse and service of sin in order that we might be liberated children of God and as such not only heirs of God's eternal kingdom, but willing servants also, walking in all His commandments of love.

If God's object in redeeming us would have been simply to deliver us from the condemnation of sin and translate us at once into His perfected kingdom, then there would seem to be no reason why as soon as one has been brought to faith in Christ he should not be translated at once. But this He does not do. Usually many years intervene before the child may enter into the joys of its Father's kingdom. God means that he should first pass through a long term of schooling, of discipline, of service; and this schooling, this discipline, this service has its basis in our relations to our fellowmen. Preeminently in our relation to one another we are to work out our salvation on the basis of "love thy neighbor as thyself." We cannot feed and clothe Christ in person, nor does He need this, but we can feed and clothe our needy neighbor. The monk therefore, shut up in his cell to himself or his little commun-

ity, is not the divine pattern of the Christian's life; but he is who, whether in public or private life, comes in contact with others as duty directs and who seeing their needs, both temporal and spiritual, ministers to their wants as strength and opportunity prescribe. He is like the babbling brook, threading its way through field and forest and leaving a track of springing verdure and bloom. And that is what our master is looking for; He wants to see our lives bloom out with acts of love and mercy.

"That man may last, but never lives,
Who much receives, but nothing gives:
Whom none can love, whom none can thank,
Creation's blot, creation's blank.

"But he who marks from day to day
In gen'rous acts his radiant way,
The same path treads the Savior trod,
The path to glory and to God."

These are the persons, too, loved not only of God, but also of man. It is in accordance with popular and human feeling; the men people love best are the men who have done the most good. We admire the great intellect, we admire the skilled hand, we stand amazed at the feats of strength and ingenuity accomplished by these great ones of the earth, but we love the man with a big heart and with feet and hands willing to minister to the needs of the afflicted.

But there is another element in this service that must not be overlooked; it is the question of final motive. What do these works for? for whose sake? If only for man's sake, then they are simply humanitarian deeds and have no direct connection with God. They are then simply earthly, they reach no higher than the tops of men's heads and they can lay claim to no higher reward than the gratitude of men. Then too we need make no distinction between the deeds of the Christian and the non-Christian, of the believer and the unbeliever. For conversion and faith in Christ are

not essential in order that one may love his neighbor with reference to merely earthly relations and conditions and to helpfulness in this sphere. We find such ministration even among the unbelieving. Indeed, the world often boasts of more beneficence than the church. However we must not concede too much to this claim. The fact is that only where the Gospel of Christ is preached do we find the product of charity as required by our text. In pagan lands it is not known, though all traces of human feeling have not been lost even there. Yet for such loving helpfulness as we find in Christian lands we look in vain. In India, for example, they have hospitals for animals but none for men. Homes, asylums, hospitals and the like, whether erected by the church or state, by Christians or by non-Christians, are essentially, so far as their ultimate origin is concerned at least, Christian institutions, the products of the preaching fo the Gospel.

Therefore, too, the final motive of these acts of loving service must be Christ himself, service to Him; ye did it unto Me, said the King to those on His right hand. They, of course, disclaimed the honor. "When saw we Thee an hungered, and gave Thee meat?" etc. But they simply meant that they never did these things to Christ in person. It was no disclaimer that they stood in no vital relation to Him, that they did not believe in Him or did not do these things essentially for His sake; no evidence at all that it was not the love of God in Christ that moved them to these things. The very fact that they were not conscious of having rendered this service shows the more plainly the right spirit on their part; they did not seek a reward, nor praise or glory, but they did these things because the love of Christ constrained them.

Along this line then we divide the charities of mankind into two great classes; on the one side we place all that which is done simply for man's sake and which has its origin in natural humane feeling and commiseration for the unfortunate, such as we often find manifested also in the animal world. It is noble, we admire it, but like David's

chieftains, it does not attain to the glory of the first class. There is a great gulf fixed between the two and neither one can pass over to the other. For on the other side is that service which is the outgrowth of faith in Christ and of a new life by the grace and spirit of God. It is not always easy to distinguish between the two. It is like classifying works of art. You or I would probably make a very poor classification of such works. We would quite probably classify with works of art many a painting that had perhaps little more to recommend it than skillful coloring and a certain catchy effect. The true artist, however, who understands all the underlying principles of art, who looks not only at the picture, but through it, he would find no difficulty in assigning each piece to its proper class. So also the great Judge at the last day, who knows all the principles and essentials of the divine life and its service, who not only looks at our works but through them and down into the bottom of our hearts and tests the very fountain and reins of our activities. He will find no trouble in classifying the manifold works of men; and whither the works thither the workmen: To the right thou, to the left thou. And from that decision there shall be no appeal.

We need to note further that the service demanded here is within the reach of all. Not great things are demanded, things the world is pleased to call great and which are permitted only a few to perform. You are not expected to discover a continent, nor conquer an empire nor endow a noted institution, nor write a classical book or do a famous painting. No specially great talents are required for this service, nor exceptional opportunities; nor is it confined to special classes or localities; neither do you need to go aside from your ordinary path of daily duty. All that the great King asks of you is that as you go up and down the paths of your ordinary callings and daily occupation, you keep your eyes open to see the hungry, the naked, the sick, the stranger who cross your path and that with loving hands as the children of God you minister unto their needs.

The Christian religion in this respect is not hard to practice; there are plenty of opportunities for all to serve our Lord and King in our fellowmen. Here is a poor family, there a sick person whom you can help and cheer; here is an unfortunate young woman, there a discouraged young man who needs your sympathy and counsel; here is an outcast, there a backslider from the church whom, by your loving interest and wise counsel, you may possibly win back for Christ and His kingdom. No, there is no lack of opportunity, the field is large, the difficulty is not here. The difficulty is in the heart; if the heart is right and willing, then the eye will see the hungry, the naked, the sick, the stranger, and the hand will be quick to minister to their needs.

Here now, before we go farther, I wish to make an observation. I have been thinking much of late about these things, about the final judgment, its manner and possible outcome. On the one hand, we see unlimited opportunities in the world for doing good; on the other hand, we see how Christ demands these things of us and even makes our final salvation dependent thereon as the fruit of a living faith. What now is the Church, what are we, doing between the opportunity, on the one hand, and Christ's demand, on the other? I suppose we ministers are ready to affirm that we faithfully and conscientiously preach pure doctrine, that we hold the Bible to be the inspired Word of God and that we mean to stand by its teachings, that we impress upon our hearers the great need of holding fast to the form of sound words and of not departing from the doctrines which they have learned, that we dwell especially much upon the fundamental doctrine of justification alone by faith and make that the article of a standing or falling church. I suppose we are all ready, preacher and hearer, to appear before Christ and to confess our faith with a good conscience. Very well, God be praised for such hope and boldness. But how about these other thnigs? How about the needy, the sick, the stranger, and thousands of others along our daily pathway who need our sympathy

and help? Oh, what a faltering confession will we not have to make here; what trembling of knees will there not be! Well may we heed in this our Savior's words, These ye should have done and not left the other undone. The Lutheran church is known for her emphatic preaching of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. We are proud of the distinction. But, brethren, let us not preach the doctrine blindly; we dare not fail to preach with equal emphasis the life in which such a faith, if it is genuine, must issue. And as to work-righteousness we constantly warn our people aganist it as fatal to eternal life and we do well in doing so, as shall be seen further on. But as to work-righteousness in works of which our text speaks, are we really much in danger here? In the face of our meager synodical and congregational records with reference to works of benevolence, and, I suppose, we may also include the records of our individual lives, does it not rather appear that what we are in danger of and against what we need special warning is not work or self-righteousness, but—and I want to emphasize the point—the righteousness of a faith that is dead, though it may be very orthodox.

In studying the believer's final acquittal at the last day we note, secondly, that

THE ACQUITTAL RESTS ON THE LAW OF FAITH.

This is not expressly stated in our text, but it is clearly and necessarily implied. It is only the believer who does the things which Christ here so highly commends; and the believer does them just because he is a believer. We find already that the service of men rendered one to another, without any reference of it to God, has its root in faith. We do good to one another from love; at least love should be the controlling motive: "Love thy neighbor" is the divine command. But love rests on faith. You cannot love a man unless you believe in him. If you have no faith in him, if you believe him to be a wicked, ungrateful, worthless fellow who will never come to anything good, then as a matter of

course you can have no love for him; and any service you might render him would not be a service of love and hence also it would be morally worthless so far as the doer is concerned. But yet you can still love that worthless wretch, not for his own sake, but, we will suppose, for the sake of a friend of yours who at the same time stands in some friendly relation with the first person. For the sake of that friend, too, you are ready to serve the worthless fellow whom, left alone, you could only disdain. But this loving service rests on faith, faith in your friend. In this way for the sake of others, we are often led to bless where we are rather inclined to curse. This train of thought now leads us higher. There is One who is the friend of all men, one who loves all, even when they do not love Him, God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. In Him we believe, in His love, mercy, goodness and faithfulness us-ward; and because He is such a God to us, therefore we also love Him. For His sake we love our fellowmen, for we know that He loves them and is seeking their salvation; and we know too that He wants us to love and save them for His sake. Yet not only for His sake, but also for their own sake, since they also have immortal souls that have been redeemed by the blood of Christ and there is still hope that they may accept the price of that redemption. In this way we are to love our enemies even. There is still something about them in which we can believe, viz., their possible salvation; and for God's sake who has loved and redeemed them we are to love and serve them.

But we need to note further that this faith upon which loving service rests is specifically faith in Christ. It is of course faith in God, but since God has revealed to us His love and mercy and eternal redemption in Christ, therefore, our faith centers upon Christ as our Savior. With faith, therefore, we lay hold upon Christ as our Savior who has redeemed us from sin and death, in whom we have forgiveness of sin, righteousness, peace, the gift of the Holy Ghost, eternal life and whatever else there is that belongs to the heavenly kingdom. All this we have in

Christ; all this we have because we have Christ; and all this we hold and possess as our own because we believe in Christ. And when we now consider that Christ is just as rich toward our fellowmen as He is to us; just as rich to all without distinction of class or person; alike rich to the humble and lowly, to the poor, to the rich, to the great, to the learned; alike rich to the white man, the black man, the red man, the yellow man; that His friendship and pleading love go out to all these even as to us; how now could we possibly, if we are His friends, if we believe in Him and love Him —how would it be possible for us to refuse to clothe the needy and to bring cheer to the comfortless? Is not what our Savior here at the last judgment demands the most natural thing in the world to expect? What other acceptable fruit could the good tree produce? What else is to be expected of us, if we are at all like Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for money?

When we consider further that this faith in Christ which worketh by love is a living thing with hands and feet and eyes and ears as Luther says, that by laying hold upon the manifold grace of God it has begotten a new life within, a life ready to offer itself upon the altar of loving service to fellowmen and of grateful obedience to God—considering these things, I say, how else could we expect Christ to test our lives finally, if not by the method shown in our text,— the lives of us who are God's "workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them?" Here then are the greatest reasons in the world why we should give ourselves to loving Christian service. It is the only logical and consistant life that we can live. We were created in Christ Jesus for that very purpose; let us not repudiate God's great plan for us. Justified? Yes, most freely justified by His grace, but justified, not to live unto ourselves as the rich man selfishly stored his greater barns with the abundance the Lord had given him, but justified that we might live unto Him who died and gave himself for us. That's the

life, the service which Christ expects and will demand—" for my sake "—" Ye have done it unto me."

Furthermore, for this principle of faith in Christ as the only basis of true loving service and of a life acceptable to God we must contend and contend for it manfully at the present day. The notion is very popular and very prevalent and many who call themselves Christians seem to be not a little effected by it, that if a man lives an upright, moral life, maintains a good reputation in the community, is a valuable citizen, a good neighbor and especially if he is kind, helpful and abundant in works of benevolence—that these things are all that can be asked of him and all that will be asked and that as a matter of course, his title to the blessed mansion above is clear. Christ is ignored, He is ruled out as unnecessary to a true life. Here there is no justification by grace, no faith in Christ as the Savior who has atoned for sin, no gift of the Holy Spirit, no service for Christ's sake. Whatever is distinctively Christian has been banished; and so without Christ and in reality without God men seek to save themselves by an outwardly moral life and a service that appeals to the sympathies of the human heart. This is one of the dreams with which much of the world has become intoxicated and which has rendered multitudes callous to the preaching of the Gospel. It has its root in the prevalent rationalism of the day, that everything needful can be accomplished by reason and human strength, that there is no need for a supernatural revelation, no need for a supernatural Savior, but that every man can be his own Savior by virtue of the moral powers by him possessed.

Here, too, is the work-righteousness against which we need to warn in particular, not the work-righteousness of such as engage in loving service for the sake of Christ, for God knows that we are doing little enough of that and few of us, I dare say, would care to stake our salvation on our works, though this service is just what the text demands—but that righteousness which ignores Christ as the divine Savior and makes man his own savior by virtue of a natural morality and humane treatment of his fellowmen. It has

much to say about the brotherhood of man and may even sound aloud the fatherhood of God, but it leaves out the Sonship and the Messiahship of Christ.

This warning we need to take to heart, for the evil is one that eateth like a cancer. As children of God, as disciples of Christ, who have been freely justified by the grace of God through faith, born again of the Spirit, enriched with a new life and with the powers of the world to come, let us haste to go on feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, taking in the stranger, thus marking our ordinary daily paths with deeds of love and kindness done for the sake of Christ, a sacrifice emitting a sweet-smelling savor and acceptable to the Most High, then shall we on that final day hear the blessed acquittal and receive the welcome, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Amen.

NOTES AND NEWS.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

I. THE PROTESTANTS AND THE POPE.

The most noteworthy and significant feature in connection with the death of Pope Leo XIII. is the lavish praise showered upon the departed pontiff by the Protestant press and pulpit. These seemed to vie with the Roman Catholics in the bestowal of laudations upon the head of that religious communion which has, since the days of the Reformation, been the embodiment of opposition to the essential principles of evangelical Christianity, to those truths and teachings that were the historic occasion for the existence of Protestantism as a distinct organization, and that justified and justify its continued maintenance in the face of the charge of apostasy, heresy, and schism. As a phenomenon in religious and ecclesiastical thought and life, this extreme friendliness for that official whom the Protestant fathers did not hesitate to call the Antichrist, which conviction found its expression in several of the Protestant confessional writings, nota-

bly the Westminster Confession of the Reformed Church and the Smalcald articles of the Lutheran, is new and unique, and as such demands an explanation. What does it indicate as to the status of the religious world? Are the two great religious communions, that for four hundred years have not only been rivals but enemies, come to a better understanding, and have they reached a "modus vivendi" without a sacrifice of principle? Or does it signify that the one or the other of the contending parties has come to the conclusion that the principles it has maintained all along as its "raison d'etre" no longer deserve to be regarded as such, and can be sacrificed for the purpose of "living and letting live" in the religious world? That a good deal of this promiscuous praise in Protestant circles, too, is nothing but cant and ignorance, as thoughtless as, and meaningly expressive of, the old dictum "De mortuis nil nisi bonum," admits of neither doubt nor debate. But enough remains after deducting this factor to make the matter a serious problem, certainly important enough to vex and perplex the thoughtful student of modern religious thought and life.

If there has been a concession of principle and a sacrifice of principle, it certainly has not been on the part of the Catholic Church. It has often been maintained that the development of Protestantism has been of great service to the Catholic Church in compelling that Church to stop the growth of certain evil tendencies; and it is true that where the two great churches stand and labor side by side, as is the case in America, England, and Germany, we find the Catholic Church at her best, and certainly vastly better spiritually than in such purely Catholic countries as Spain and Italy, where the enjoyment of the monopoly permits her to develop her immoral nature without fear or restraint. But the German Church historian Uhlhorn is also correct when he declares, that the origin of the Protestant Church has harmed the Catholic Church seriously, insofar as the Catholic Church was compelled to formulate and fix for

all times officially, in opposition to the teachings of Protestants, the false principles which the latter antagonized. In this way historic causes have barred and prevented the Catholic Church from the way to a better knowledge of the Biblical truths, and for this reason that Church must ever remain the representative and protagonist of these false teachings, or cease to be what it is. The "semper idem" must be one of her cardinal principles. "Sit ut est, aut non sit." She can not and does not change except in external conduct and form, and in these matters, by her policy of "posse tolerari," is extremely pliable.

And this is the case, too, in face of the so-called "independent movement" that characterizes the life of that Church to-day. We hear of the "Away-from-Rome" propaganda in the German provinces of the Austrian empire; of the "Former-Priest" agitation in France; of the Biblical movement also in France, under the leadership of the learned savant, Professor Loisy; of the agitation in favor of a "Reformer Catholicism" in Germany against the "Political Catholicism' represented by the ultra-montane powers that be in the hierarchy; of of the "Christian Democracy" in the Church of Italy; yet when all these movements are closely analyzed, with the exception of the Austrian agitation, there is not one in favor of any Protestant principles, but all aim only at the removal of certain objectionable features in the Roman Catholic Church itself. Even Bourrier, the leader of the "Former Priests," refuses to connect himself with the Protestant cause, his ideal being a spiritualized Catholic Church. Professor Kraus, head of the German movement, lived and died a good Catholic, and never aimed to be anything else. In none of these men is there to be found a spark of the fire that burned in Luther's heart; the movement they head is largely intellectual in character, one of the head and not one of the heart, as was Old Catholicism, which is now even farther from Protestantism than it was in 1871 after the Vatican Council.

And in each and every case the church officials have condemned or crushed these independent movements, if at all possible. They develop not in accordance with the wishes of the hierarchy, but against the trends and tendencies that prevail at headquarters. Professor Ehrhard, the successor of Kraus, has been compelled to recant his teachings; Professor Scholl of Würzburg, "laudabiliter se subjecit" repeatedly; Loisy has come to an understanding with his superiors, and so on.

Nor is there the least indication that Leo XIII. and his cardinals made the least concessions in the direction of Protestant principles. The decrees of the Council of Trent, that monument of errors against Evangelical truth, is still the official expression of Catholic teachings. The Syllabus, issued by Pio Nono, in which he condemned everything that Protestantism and modern civilization consider the greatest achievements of modern times, is still the guiding star in the thought that controls the theology of the Vatican; in none of his many encyclicaea has Leo XIII. indicated that he has departed one iota from the traditional teachings or spirit of the Church. At heart he has been the same as his predecessor; only as a finished diplomat has he been able to hide his claws. But in history he will stand, just as all of his predecessors since the days of Leo X., namely, as the exponent of all the principles that Protestantism has condemned and must condemn, or forfeit its right to exist as a living protest against the Church of Rome. Even when Leo XIII. seemed to yield to modern thought, as in the appointment of his Bible Commission, the concession was more seeming than real, for one of his last decrees was the command that the Commission should do nothing contrary to the traditional teachings of the Church. Not only "Americanism" within the Church, but Protestantism without, in every shape and form, was antagonized in the Vatican. Modern civilization in its highest developments, in politics, in philosophy and thought, in science and letters and literature and social life, is essen-

tially Protestant; but in every respect Leo XIII. could find no other than words of condemnation where his Church could not control, as she did in a laudable manner and with comparatively good results in the social sphere. But actual concessions to the opposing principles of Protestantism the Church of Rome has not shown even in the days of its "best of popes."

Whence, then, this waning of differences between the two great churches, so that they stand as it were a unit in their grief at the bier of the Roman pontiff? If the advance has not been made by the Roman Catholic Church, it must have been made by the Protestant. And this is actually the case, and it consists, not in a distinct acknowledgment or recognition or acceptance of Roman Catholic teachings, but in an indifference toward Protestant principles by Protestants themselves. The importance and bearing of distinctively Protestant teachings are not appreciated as keenly by the Protestants of to-day as they were in former generations. There are two distinctively evangelical principles with which the Protestant Church stands and falls,—the "articuli stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ," according to the Reformers. These are the formal and the material principles of the Reformation. The former is this, that the Word of Holy Writ, in the Scriptures, is the last court of appeals in all matters of faith and life; and the latter is the doctrine of justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law or good works. In both of the cardinals and essentials Protestantism stands out in bold contrast to Roman Catholic dogma and doctrine.

In both of these principles the so-called advanced theological thought in the Protestant Church has become unfaithful and has deserted the landmarks of her faith. The Biblical criticism of the day, with its neological results, has compelled advanced thinkers to look for another basis than the Scriptures as a foundation for their faith, and they have found this new foundation in the "Historic Christ," which practically means the purely human but

humanly great Christ of the Synoptic Gospels, and not the God-man of the Fourth. Whatever may be the right or the wrong of modern Biblical criticism, certain it is that an acceptance of its teachings compels a discarding of the formal principle of the Reformation concerning the absolute authority of the Scriptures. This explains why modern theology rejects the "juridic" authority of the Written Word, and at best recognizes, not the Scriptures as the Word of God, but only as containing the Word of God. These conclusions are only natural and necessary if the canonical writings lack all inspiration and are only a collection of Hebrew sacred writings that contain more or less good religious teachings, altho in their present form they thoroughly misrepresent the actual religious development in Israel and in early Christianity. Advanced modern Protestantism can not, therefore, and does not, adhere to its own formal principle.

Nor does it to its material, as such essential matters as the doctrine of the person of Christ, the vicarious atonement, etc., are discarded in the sense of original Protestantism, and Christianity is made essentially little more than a system of ethical principles as imitative of the spirit and conduct of the "Historical Christ."

At bottom then this seeming absence of cardinal differences and distinctions between the Protestant and the Catholic churches, as evidenced by the pulpit and press of the Protestant Church, is a "testimonium paupertatis" for the Church of the Reformation, a public proclamation that she no longer feels the keen edge of the principles that did and should still constitute her life-blood. She makes concessions to error because she no longer appreciates the truth she has represented for four centuries. It is a fortunate thing that it is only a portion of the Protestant Church that evinces this spirit, and equally fortunate that such periods of low spirituality and superficial appreciation of the highest and deepest truths, which appear from time to time in the annals of Protestantism, as was the case in the period of the "Rational-

ismus Vulgaris" in Germany and of Deism in England, are of short duration and give way to a revival of positive evangelical thought and life. The beginnings of such a revival in the Protestant theological thought of the day are already at hand. "Vivant sequantia!"

II. THE BABISM OF PERSIA.

Some new information that that unique philosophico-religious system known as Babism has been furnished by the Oriental traveler, A. Arakeljan, who has spent a number of months among this people and reports the results of his observations and studies in an address delivered in the Geographical Society of Tiflis. The following data and opinions are quoted from this address as given in the Supplement of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 192:

The founder of Babism was Mirsa Ala Mohammed, born in 1819, and the pupil of leading teachers of Moslem wisdom in Persia. The Shiites or Mohammedan Protestants, believe that after the death of the twelve Imams, or great teachers, the door (bab) of wisdom and service is to be opened to mankind. Ali Mohammed declared that this door had been opened through and in him, and since May, 1844, his doctrine, called Babism, has spread rapidly throughout Persia, winning many adherents among the most prominent people, especially the women. The execution of the leader in his thirty-first year only increased the zeal of his followers, and since the present Shah has occupied the throne, the persecutions of this sect has ceased. In Persia it has three million adherents and in Syria, Egypt, India and China together two million more.

Western scholars have always been particularly interested in this religious movement on account of its close connection with certain phases of Christian thought, and missionaries have frequently expressed the conviction that through Babism, and through it alone, Christianity could find an entrance into the Moslem world of thought.

The fundamental doctrines of Babism are found in the work written by Ali Mohammed entitled "Bejan," which contains commentaries on the Bible, the Gospels and the Koran. The leading principles are those of "ichtigat" and "ittifak," i. e. the oneness and the solidarity of the whole human race. All men are brethren. All peoples should speak one language and have "one" system of writing. The woman is the equal of the man and, like him, is free, and mistress of herself. Monogamy is to be recommended. It is necessary to learn all the sciences and to acquire foreign languages. The Babist must obey the laws of the land in which he lives. Work is necessary to the happiness of man, and is therefore the duty of everybody. Idleness is sin. All wars are to be condemned. Men are to settle their controversies not with the sword but with words and arguments and reason. It is much better to be killed than to kill somebody else. All controversies between nations should be settled by arbitration. Babism condemns both the ordinance of baptism and confession. The system recognizes no saints or holy men. Circumcision is accepted for hygienic reasons.

The leading prophets of Babism are Moses, Jesus and Mohamed. Jesus is regularly called "the Son of God," and in this respect this system goes beyond the Koran, which declares Him to be only the "Son of Mirjam," i. e. Mary and claims that his original teachings were in harmony with the Moslem theology, but had been falsified by the Apostles. Prayer is regarded as necessary, but not as a daily practice. At their meetings held for worship the Babists sing hymns in the Arabic, Persian and Tartaric languages, and in connection with this service drink tea and coffee and smoke their "koljan" or water pipes. They do not observe any fasts, but during the nineteen days preceding the New Year they eat only in the evening. They believe in a future life, but reject the doctrines of heaven, hell and purgatory. They are convinced that every human being will receive in the world beyond the reward or the punishment for his deeds on earth, but it

has not been revealed to man just how all this is to take place. Asceticism and celibacy are forbidden to men, every lie is a hienous offense, and the same is true of all flattery. The "taglie" of the Moslem system, which permits everybody to act the hypocrite and to deny his faith, when his life is endangered, has not been changed by the Babists.

They divide the year into 19 months, each of 19 days. The year accordingly numbers 361 days, to which are added the so-called days of "takdis," i. e. of purification and preparation for the new year. In general the number 19 plays a great role among the Babists. Bab had 18 pupils, and there have accordingly been 19 proclaimers of the new faith. Allah, who among the Moslems has an endless number of names, has only 19 among the Babists. Their holy book Bejan has 19 chapters, etc.

III. THE SOLIDARITY MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.

A Christian Socialistic propaganda, under the leadership of the indefatigable Reformed pastor of Rouen, Wilfred Monod, and known as the Solidarity Movement, or "Messianism," to use the favorite term of the leader, has, in recent months, spread a network of practical Christian activity for the lower classes throughout France and has become a fixed fact in modern religious life. In many respects it is suggestive of the Inner Mission Movement in the Protestant Church of Germany, but differs from this again in the limitation of its work to actual care for the neglected poor, and in a certain indifference to the dogmatical teachings of the Church. It is a movement that is based on the law of Christian love, especially as this is to be applied to the neglected masses, and aims to demonstrate practically that genuine Christianity consists in the coöperation of all believers for the raising of the masses to a higher culture and condition while in their present surroundings. It is a gospel of work for this world. It has enlisted the coöperation of a large number of younger pastors, all of them, practically with-

out exception, men of positive evangelical convictions, as also the enthusiastic support of such men as Pastors Gounelle, of Roubaix; Quievreux, of Nille; Neel, of Ulais; Roth, of Orthez, and among the laity Louis Counte, of St. Etienne, the leader of the Free Air Movement in France. Among its literary advocates is the gifted preacher of Geneva, Frank Thomas. All these men maintain that it is a matter of comparative indifference what the metaphysical distinctions and differences are in theological teachings concerning the Trinity and other doctrines and that salvation in the world beyond is not the first and chief object of Christianity, but rather the purpose of Christ was to establish a kingdom upon this earth in which His spirit and power shall rule supreme. Hence the movement is also called "Messianism," and all of the adherents are thoroughly imbued with strong chiliastic ideas. Christ's idea will not be realized until all, rich and poor, high and low, learn to love and treat each other as brethren and Christians thus become a solidarity. Monod and others strongly condemn the individualism of Protestantism, and allow an individual personal Christianity only as an educational means for the establishment of Christianity in the masses as such. It is a false Christianity that thinks one's self a stranger in this world and heaven as his real home. This is pure pessimism and a crude and dismal creed. The "New-Christians," which term they also apply to themselves, hope to make a heaven of this earth, and it is accordingly not strange that they have already tried to reach an understanding with the regular political Socialists, hoping to imbue that movement with the spirit of Christ. In their organ, the "L'Avantgarde," a long series of replies to the question, whether Christianity and Social Democracy are compatible appeared recently from the pens of leading Social Democrats, as also from professors, theologians and political leaders. The Solidarity agitation has, however, by no means confined itself to discussion and debate, but has given practical demon-

stration of its teachings. Throughout the country associations called "Solidarities" have been established in which their ideal is being realized. These establishments usually consist of a hall for lectures, divine services and concerts, together with a library and a reading room. In Rouen the "Solidarity" occupies a whole two-story building, with a hall for six hundred auditors, a "refuge room" for boys and one for girls, a department for the "blue cross" and one for the "white cross," a "high school department," in which professors, physicians, pastors and others meet to discuss religious and social problems, a restaurant is in connection with this building, in which no alcoholic drinks are to be sold. In addition there are several rooms for travelers. These "Solidarities" earnestly invite non-members, especially such extreme opponents as atheists and anarchists, for friendly discussion. The regular Protestant clergy of France is, as a rule, friendly to the movement, although not liking its doctrinal peculiarities. In Paris, e. g. on last Easter, the great communion day of the year, the Lutheran pastor of St. Denis, after his own services, conducted a "feast of love" in connection with a service for beggars in the neighboring "Sodality." The whole movement is spreading rapidly.

IV. RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS.

Among the most interesting discoveries of recent months is the finding of some Samaritan inscriptions in Damascus, made recently in an old building of that city by the Turkish military physician, Dr. Theogene Bey. It is not generally known that in addition to the historical Samaritan communion in Nablus with its venerable High Priest and its annual services on Mount Gerizim, there has existed for decades the remnants of a Samaritan congregation in Damascus with its own priest and synagogue. The new find consists of seven Samaritan inscriptions, which have lately been deciphered by Dr. Alois Mufil, professor in the theological faculty at Olmütz, and reported in the publication of the Vienna Academy of Sciences. The in-

scriptions were cut in an elegant piece of marble which at one time decorated the walls of the Samaritan Synagogue. They contain the letters with which the customary Samaritan formulas of prayers begin. In the Samaritan liturgy a short prayer is spoken after each strophe of a hymn. These prayers are called al-Katafs. The contents of these inscriptions are taken directly from the Hebræo-Samaritan text of the Pentateuch. As the readings in a number of places differ from the Hebrew, these inscriptions have not only an historical but also a textcritical value. The excavations in ancient Pergamos have been resumed by Dr. Dörpfeld, the details of the new finds being reported in the Smyrna papers. In digging in the neighborhood of the old Acroopolis a large hall surrounded by columns was unearthed, dating from the early Byzantine period. The hall was evidently an old portico, fully sixty metres in length. Therein were found a number of valuable archæological relics, among them a woman's head in marble, life size; the basis of the statue, the inscription indicating that it is one of Æsculapius; a large vase with a picture of Apollo. Of special interest are four marble plates with a hieroglyptic form of writing and different scenes, such as actors playing their roles, pictures of men, women and girls, as also of comedy actors. Of two other marble heads one represents Bacchus and the other probably the Empress Faustina, the wife of Marcus Aurelius. In the latest issue of the Reports of the German Archæological Society in Rome, Professor Petersen, the leader, describes in detail the recent excavations and reconstruction of the famous *"Ara Pocis Augustae,"* of which large parts but not all has been unearthed. The leading statue clearly betrays the characteristic features of the Emperor and is almost perfectly preserved. The heads to the left of the Emperor are evidently those of the "Fasses," being directed by a leader in the conduct of the procession. The form of the actor is clearly outlined. The report closes with the statement that what has been found is only the smaller portion of what yet remains to be unearthed and reconstructed.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. APRIL, 1904. No. 2.

THE ANALOGY OF FAITH.*

BY REV. C. C. HEIN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

In order to understand the question at issue, it will be necessary for us to state the doctrine of predestination as taught by the Missouri Synod. In regard to this doctrine the Missouri Synod teaches the following: After God, in eternity, had foreseen the fall of man; after he had decreed to redeem all mankind through Jesus Christ; after, in his foresight, this redemption was wrought for all, and the way of salvation prepared for all; God in eternity elected some that they, and only they, should in time come to persevering faith in Christ and be finally saved. The elect, and only the elect, come to persevering faith and are saved because God elected them in eternity to faith and eternal life. Why did God elect them? His grace and the merits of Christ induced him to do so. We know of no other reason. We know why he did not elect those who are lost. He foresaw

*The writer wishes to state that in preparing this paper for the Columbus Local Conference, he made use of "Theses on the Analogy of Faith" and their discussion as found in the Minutes of the Northern District of the Missouri Synod of 1877. These theses are reprinted in the "Theologische Zeitblaetter" of January, 1904. Any one who will examine them without prejudice and read the discussion in connection with these theses, will come to the conclusion that the Missouri Synod, in 1877, held the position which is, at present, maintained by us, and which has always been maintained by the Lutheran Church. The minutes of the Missouri Synod not being in everybody's possession, the writer made use of them in preparing some parts of II and III of this paper for Conference.

their unbelief and their willful resistance to the Holy Spirit who wanted to convert them. Therefore, he did not elect them. But why he elected those who are saved, we do not know. It is a mystery. The rule according to which God elected, is not revealed in the Scriptures. In regard to the salvation of man we find two statements in the Scriptures. In the first place: God earnestly desires to save all. Christ redeemed all. The way of salvation is prepared for all. The word and the sacraments are intended for all. The Holy Spirit desires to convert all through the means of grace, and the same grace of conversion is offered to all. This is the universal will of grace, and it embraces all, the elect and those who are eternally lost. Secondly, the Scriptures teach that, although those who are lost, are lost by their own fault, because they resist the Holy Spirit, God removes this resistance, found in everybody, only in the elect, and saves them because he elected them. Besides the universal grace of God, there is a particular grace to which the salvation of the elect is due, and this grace is only for the elect. These two statements of Scriptures, these two wills of God, the universal and the particular, seem to be in contradiction to each other. Our human reason can not harmonize them. And to do so is not necessary. We can not harmonize them except by falling into error, either Calvinism, or Pelagianism and Synergism. We must submit our reason to the Word of God. There is a great mystery between these two truths, which we can never solve. Both of them must be believed. This is the position of the Missouri Synod.

Our synod rejects this doctrine. It will not and can not accept it because it does not find it in the Word of God and in the Confessions of our Lutheran Church. This doctrine is not in harmony with the analogy of faith but in contradiction to it. We claim that all the interpretations of Scripture and the doctrines, taught in the Church, must be in harmony with the analogy of faith. We claim that a doctrine not in harmony with the analogy of faith is a false doctrine and can not be tolerated. This doctrine of election,

as taught by the Missouri Synod, contradicts the doctrine of universal grace. It establishes two *contradictorias voluntates in Deo.* Therefore, it must be false.

The Missourians answer: Here lies your error. The universal will of grace and the particular will of election have nothing to do with each other. There can not be any analogy between them. Each one is a doctrine of Scripture by itself. Each one must be obtained and found in its *sedes doctrinae.* Whatever is contained in the *sedes doctrinae expressis verbis,* is the analogy of faith of that particular doctrine. If that does not seem to agree with other doctrines, it must, nevertheless, be accepted. If our human reason can not harmonize it, and finds a contradiction, we must simply stop to reason and submit to the Word of God. It is not the calling of a theologian to bring the different doctrines revealed in Scriptures into harmony, and to show that they are in harmony with each other. No, he should hear what God tells him and say what he has heard, although the doctrines he has heard and found in Scriptures may seem to be in contradiction to each other. Each doctrine of Scriptures has an analogy of its own. It is found in its *sedes doctrinae.* Whatever is contained there, is the analogy of faith of that particular doctrine. And whatever I teach in regard to this doctrine, must be in accord with its analogy of faith, even if it does seemingly not agree with other doctrines. Therefore, we accept both statements of the Scriptures, the one regarding the universal will of God, and the other regarding the particular will of election. Both are true. Both must be believed. If we can not bring them into harmony with one another we are not ashamed to confess: Here is a mystery, which we can not solve.

This theory of the Missouri Synod in regard to the analogy of faith is something entirely new in the Lutheran Church. We have been unable to find these principles in any of our dogmaticians. Undoubtedly, their false doctrine of predestination has led the Missourians to this. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." 1 Cor. 5, 6. They

know that it is a Lutheran principle that all doctrine, taught in the Church, must be according to the analogy of faith. In order to remain seemingly true to this principle, and still retain their doctrine of predestination, and base it on a Lutheran principle, they have changed the conception, the sense of the term analogy of faith, and have introduced a theory into the Church which, if carried out, will open the doors to all kinds of false doctrines and errors. In order to understand clearly why our Lutheran Church has established this analogy of faith theory, and how it desires it to be applied, let us try to answer the following questions:

I. On what is this theory based?
II. What is the analogy of faith?
III. Where and how should it be applied? And
IV. The analogy of faith theory — according to the Missouri conception of it — applied in doctrine and interpretation of the Scriptures, to what will it lead?

I.

On what is the analogy of faith theory based? We answer: It has a Scriptural, a Biblical foundation. It is based on Romans 12, 7. Our German translation reads: Hat jemand Weissagung, so sei sie dem Glauben ähnlich. Our English translation: Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith. The original reads: *ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν, διάφορα· εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαναν τῆς πίστεως*. The construction of this sentence: *εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως* is rather difficult. Without going into detail, we take it for granted that St. Paul in this passage is giving a short exhortation. We have to supply something in order to get a complete sentence. With the best exegetes of our times and of those of old, Luther, Melanchthon, Olshausen, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Meyer, Philippi, von Hoffman, and Nebe we complete this sentence as follows: *εἴτε προφητείαν ἔχοντες, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως προφητεύωμεν*. If we have prophecy, let us prophesy according to the analogy

of faith. What does this mean? Two terms have to be explained: προφητεύω and πίστις. What does προφητεύω mean? The fathers of our Church, Luther and the Lutheran dogmaticians and exegetes of old, find a twofold sense in the word προφητεύω, namely, to prophesy, i. e., to reveal the future, having been taught and by inspiration of God, as the prophets and apostles have done, and furthermore, to interpret the Scriptures, the Word of God already in existence. They claim St. Paul uses the word προφητεύω in this passage in the latter sense. He admonishes those who have the gift of interpreting the Scriptures to interpret the same κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. The studies of our modern, even our Lutheran Biblical scholars, however, have led them to the conviction that the word προφητεύω is never used in the Scriptures in the sense of "interpret." It means to "speak by inspiration." We can not find a single Scripture passage in which it is used in another sense. Trench says (Synonyms, p. 19): "We meet with προφητεύω as the constant word in the New Testament to express the prophesying by the Spirit of God. The προφήτης is the outspeaker, he who speaks out the counsel of God with the clearness, energy and authority which spring from the consciousness of speaking in God's name, and having received a direct message from Him to deliver." Philippi says (Glaubenslehre I. p. 42): "Prophecy is a communication of divine knowledge, a witnessing of the divine act of revelation, an interpretation of the divine idea in the divine Word expressed in that act. We, indeed, here take prophecy in a wider sense than that which is common and usual. But this conception is founded as well in the thing itself as in Holy Writ. The office of the prophets of the Old Testament did certainly not merely consist in foretelling future events, which is prophecy in the stricter sense, but also in testifying to, and interpreting the revelation acts of the Lord in the past and at the present time. And also in the New Testament the conception of prophecy embraces every *inspired* testimony concerning revealed truths communicated by God. Compare Rom. 12, 6. 1 Cor. 14. Eph. 2, 20. Tit. 1, 12." προφητεύω in the New Testament means: To speak by inspiration. We adopt this explanation, knowing of no passage in which it is used in another sense. St. Paul says:

If somebody has prophecy, i. e., if he speaks by inspiration, this prophecy should be κατὰ τὴς ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. What does πίστις mean? πίστις is either the faith with which we believe, *fides, qua creditur*, subjective faith, or the faith, which we believe, *fides, quæ creditur*, objective faith. Taking πίστις in the former sense it would mean: Whatever a prophet speaks by inspiration should be in harmony with his faith. It should not exceed the measure of his faith. It should not contradict it. Undoubtedly, the prophets of old were and considered themselves mouthpieces of God. And they would have sinned, if they had first compared the reveiation of God with their faith, and made their faith the rule with which every revelation must be compared before it is uttered. Subjective faith, although a gift of God, but on account of human weakness and sin a very changeable and deficient thing, can never be the rule according to which the revelation of God, His Word, and an inspired utterance must be judged. πίστις is here *fides, quæ creditur, fides, quam credimus*, objective faith. In this sense it is used, Gal. 1. 23. Εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει. He preaches the faith which once he destroyed. Jude 3. παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνιζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίυς πίστει. Exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints. In this sense the term πιστις is applied here. St. Paul wants to say: If you think that you are moved by the Spirit, and have a message to deliver, examine it carefully before you utter it. See if it is κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. If it is not, it can not be the Spirit of God who moves you. It must be the imaginations and fancies of your own heart, or perhaps even the whisperings of the evil one. Your message can not be a divine message if it is not κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, but in contradiction to it, as God can not contradict Himself. Do not utter it lest you are a false teacher and a false prophet, and violate the faith. But prophesy only when your prophecy is κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. This is our exegesis of Rom. 12. 7.

We are convinced that, at present, we have no more prophecy in the Church of God, no more speaking by inspiration as in the days of the Apostles. Whatever God wanted to reveal to the Church, has been revealed, and has

found its permanent place in the Scriptures. As soon as they were completed, revelation and inspired speaking ceased. The rule, however, laid down by St. Paul in Romans 12, 7 still holds good. If all prophesying, all inspired speaking must be *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, then also all interpretation of the Scriptures must be *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*. This is a *conclusio a majore ad minus*. If the *ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως* is the rule and regulation of prophecy it must also be the rule and regulation of all teaching and interpretation of the Scriptures. We see that the analogy of faith theory is based upon biblical and scriptural grounds. — We proceed to our second question and ask

II.

What is the analogy of faith? Aristotle the Greek philosopher explains the term *ἀναλογία* by *ἰσότης τοῦ λόγου* = equality, Gleichheit. Analogy denotes the likeness between things in some circumstances or effects when these things may otherwise be entirely different. It denotes the equality, proportion or similarity of ratios. In this sense the term *ἀναλογία* has been used in mathematics. The ratio of 2 to 4 is analogous to that of 4 to 8. Cicero translates *ἀναλογία* by *similitudo rationis*, a similarity of relation. There is, for instance, an analogy between God, the angels, and the soul of man All of them are called spirits. God is an eternal Spirit, the angels and the soul of man are created spirits. This is the difference, and still there is a similarity. There is an analogy between the eagle and other fowls, but not, at least not in the same respect, between the eagle and the dog. If somebody would build a small house and would put in a barn door, he would spoil the analogy. A small house and a barn door are not in analogy. There is no analogy between a ball and a square block. Analogy denotes the equality and similarity of two things in a certain respect.

The term *ἀναλογία* is used in theology, i. e., in the doctrines of the Articles of faith to denote that they stand in harmonious relation to each other with respect to their purpose or end, namely the glory of God and the salvation of man. Rambach (Erläuterungen P. I. Lib. II, p. 316) ex-

plains this as follows: "The system of doctrines revealed by God to man may well be compared to a building as different passages of Scripture testify (1 Cor. 3, 10; Eph. 2, 20). * * * This building consists of different parts, which parts are the individual saving truths, which stand in the most beautiful connection, order, relation and symmetry with each other. These are the four parts belonging to the analogy of the Christian doctrine. They have 1) the most accurate connection with one another, a connection of truth in which one truth stands with the other. All articles of faith, namely, are joined and fitted together as the beams of a house so that you cannot remove one without, at the same time, damaging the whole structure. Luther says, therefore: *Fides est copulativa.* (Faith is a connected whole.) Whosoever denies the satisfaction of Christ must deny the justice of God which demands this satisfaction. He must deny and pervert the doctrine of a judicial (forensic) justification in which the imputation of the merits of Christ takes place. He must deny the guilt of sin of which we cannot be freed without satisfaction. These and many other fundamental truths are being violated dangerously if the truth of the satisfaction of Christ is denied. This is done on account of the accurate connection in which all these truths stand with one another. 2) The second belonging to the analagy of faith is *ordo,* the most beautiful order. As in a building each beam or girder is in its place where it should be according to the rules of the art of building, thus each part of the heavenly truths is in its proper place in the system of heavenly truths where it should be. For instance, free will in spiritual things does not belong in the state before conversion; there it is a bound will, under the bondage of sin and Satan, but it belongs in the state after conversion, in the doctrine of sanctification. There it becomes a free will or will be freed of its bondage. Thus the doctrine of good works in the narrower sense does not belong in the article of justification, but sanctification. First a good tree must be planted in regeneration before good fruits can be brought forth. 3)

Thirdly, there belongs to it (the analogy of faith) that they (the doctrines) are related to each other as one truth is related to the other, as in a building one story, window and beam is related to the other. For instance, Christ's satisfaction and our justification are related to each other. One can not be understood or explained or taught correctly without the other. Whoever denies one denies the other. Thus the doctrine of renewal is related to the doctrine of the image of God which is restored in the renewal of man according to its beginning. In treating a text concerning the renewal one must enter into the doctrine of the image of God with his heart. Then his conception and understanding of the same will be clearer. The necessity of regeneration is related to the fact that we have no free will. The doctrine of the mystical union has its foundation in the doctrine of the personal union of the divine and human nature in Christ. 4) Fourthly, there belongs to this analogy of faith a perfect symmetry as all fundamental truths are related as one to the glory of God and the salvation of man. Some truths have a mediate, others an immediate bearing on this end, some a wider, others a narrower; some a weaker, others a stronger. All, however, tend to this that the salvation of man which consists in the eternal enjoyment of God the highest gift, and which has been interrupted by the fall, be restored here in this world according to its beginning and in the world to come in perfection. These are the four parts which belong to the harmony and analogy of divine truths." The term "Article of faith," denotes that the doctrines of faith revealed in Scriptures stand in the most intimate connection and in the most beautiful relation, harmony and symmetry with each other. *Articulus* is a joint, a member of the human body. The members of the human body are fitted and joined together in the most wonderful manner and the most perfect harmony and symmetry. Man's body is the work of the omnipotence, wisdom and love of God. Every member is in its proper place, and not a single member of the body can be removed without maiming the whole body. And the nearer the re-

lation between the member which is removed and the heart, the more dangerous such an operation will be. The doctrines of the Christian faith are one body, one *corpus*. Each individual doctrine of faith is a member of that body. It can not be removed without maiming the whole body. And the nearer the relation of the individual doctrine to the center of the Christian truth: Justification by faith, the greater the danger that a person by removing this doctrine, will lose the whole truth, the whole Christian faith.

After we have seen what is meant by the analogy of faith the question arises: How do we obtain it? Certainly, human reason can not furnish it. It is blind in divine things. As the Lord has revealed his will only in the Scriptures so the Scriptures alone can give us the analogy of faith. If the Scriptures are the only source of doctrine and faith, they are also the only source of the analogy of faith. And this analogy must be contained in the Scriptures so precisely and clearly that no doubt can arise as to what belongs and what does not belong to it. If St. Paul says all prophecy should be κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, certainly, this analogy must be contained in the Scriptures so clearly that every Christian can find it. Where is it to be found? We answer: The analogy of faith is the sum of all the principal articles of faith contained in the Scriptures, and these doctrines and articles of faith are to be found in those Scripture passages which clearly and unmistakably teach these doctrines. We do not want to deny that a good many passages of Holy Scriptures are dark to us, yea, that some of them probably have never been understood correctly. They are not dark in themselves. The Word of God is the Light of the World. On account of our darkened human reason, however, they are dark to us. Undoubtedly, in those passages we can not find the analogy of faith. This must be found in passages so clear that any Christian can grasp their contents. To these passages we refer when we seek the doctrine of faith. The contents of these passages taken together form the analogy of faith.

Which are these passages? We answer: Those, which we usually call the *sedes doctrinae,* i. e. those, in which the Holy Spirit teaches a doctrine expressly and intentionally, or at least according to common consent. It is certain that any author will speak in a different manner on a subject if he intends to treat it and explain it, than he would if he refers to it only incidentally. In the former case he will treat the subject thoroughly and completely, in the latter he will not. Scripture does likewise. Whenever the Holy Spirit speaks of a doctrine intentionally, and wishes to set it forth, he speaks in plain words. One example may illustrate the matter. In Luke 1 and 2, the Holy Spirit speaks expressly and intentionally of Christ's conception and birth. To learn the doctrine concerning this truth I must refer to these passages. St. Paul, however, in Gal. 4, 4, refers to this doctrine merely incidentally. He says: God sent his son born of woman. If I would draw the conclusion that Christ was only a man because St. Paul says he is born of woman, I would err. The *sedes doctrinae* is Luke 1 and 2, and they show that Christ was conceived and born not in a natural but a supernatural manner. St. Paul in Gal. 4, 4 refers to the birth of Christ merely incidentally. In this very passage he teaches expressly and intentionally that Christ being our substitute was placed under the law.

When can we know that the Holy Spirit speaks expressly and intentionally of a certain thing? We answer: 1) When he says so. In Romans 3, 9 St. Paul says: We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin. This shows that the two preceding chapters treat of sin, original and actual sin. Here is a *sedes doctrinae.* Whenever Christ says: The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto . . . etc., he asserts that he desires to speak of His Church. The Holy Spirit shows that he speaks expressly and intentionally of a certain thing: 2) When he relates the institution of something new. When Christ institutes the Lord's Supper or St. Paul relates the institution of this sacrament, there can not be any doubt, that the *sedes doctrinae* of the Lord's Supper is to be found here. When

Christ gives the keys of heaven to St. Peter (Matt. 16), to the congregation (Matt. 18) and to his Apostles (John 20), these passages contain the *sedes doctrinae* of the office of the keys. Finally, the Holy Spirit shows that he speaks expressly and intentionally of a certain thing when 3) The context and the circumstances show it, so that nobody will deny it. Romans 3 contains the *sedes doctrinae* of justification as St. Paul testifies and proves by the Old Testament that we are justified by faith, without works. Here the context shows that this Scripture passage is the *sedes doctrinae,* and nobody will deny it.

The doctrines contained in these *sedes doctrinae* form the analogy of faith. And this analogy of faith is contained in our Lutheran Catechism. This Catechism is nothing else but the chief doctrines of the Word of God set forth and explained in such a manner that even the most simple Christian can understand them. Here lies the glory and the strength of our Lutheran Church over against all other churches. It teaches its members the Catechism, and in doing this, instructs them in every doctrine of faith of the Word of God, so that our people know the analogy of faith and have a safeguard against every false doctrine and error if they only apply the doctrine taught in our Catechism correctly. There is indeed not a single doctrine of faith which is not contained in our Catechism. By learning it a Christian gains a full understanding of all the doctrines of faith, revealed in Scriptures, and becomes able to distinguish between error and truth. Luther says in a sermon on the 8th Sunday after Trinity (Erl. Vol. 5, p. 386): "If a Christian would be diligent, and had no more than the Catechism, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Words of our Lord concerning Baptism and the Sacrament of the Altar, he could protect and defend himself against all heresies. There will never arise a better word nor a better doctrine than that which has been published a short time ago in the Catechism, and which has been taken from the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, one should abide with it so that if an heretic or enthusiast arises and

teaches another doctrine, one can say: "This is not taught correctly as it does not agree with my Catechism." No other church has such a clear and concise statement and confession of the Christian doctrine as the Lutheran Church in its Catechism. Whoever knows this Catechism has a knowledge of divine truth sufficient to protect himself against all false doctrines. He possesses the analogy of faith.

We proceed to our third question, to-wit:

III.

Where and how should the analogy of faith be applied? The term "Analogy of faith" is used in a two-fold sense. It denotes the harmonious relation of the doctrines of the Word of God among themselves, the harmonious relation of one doctrine to the other, and it denotes the sum of all articles of faith, the *regula fidei.*

As we have shown, all the doctrines of Scripture are related to each other harmoniously. Rambach compared them to a building well joined and fitted together. Whenever we think that we found a doctrine in Scriptures we must examine it carefully and see if it really belongs to this building, if there is room for it in the structure where we may place it, and by doing this not disturb other parts of the structure of Christian faith. Only such a doctrine as is analogous to the others of the Word of God and is not in contradiction to them is a correct doctrine and the Word of truth, for God can not contradict himself. We do not want to say that with our human reason, as it is by nature, we have to pass judgment on each doctrine and determine whether it seems reasonable, and whether we can provide a place for it in the system of doctrines. Our human reason is blind and darkened by nature, and is by no means a judge in matters divine. When a man is regenerated, however, the Holy Spirit enlightens his reason so that it may know and understand divine things. And his enlightened reason has certainly a calling in respect to all matters revealed in

the Scriptures. When the truth is given to the human soul by the Spirit of God, this truth by the grace of the Holy Spirit is apprehended. The person knows it by Scriptures. If we know it we can not be loyal to the Spirit if we do not apply it. There are some things, some truths we become certain about. They become a part of our faith. And now, reason, enlightened by the Spirit of God, must seek the truth more and more. It must examine everything. And when it believes that it found a doctrine it must see if this doctrine is in harmonious relation to the others, and does not contradict them. Why, for instance, do we reject Calvin's doctrine of predestination? It seems to be contained in Romans and in some other passages of Scripture. But if a Christian thinks he has found it there, let him examine if he can bring it into harmony with the other doctrines of the Word of God. He will find, it contradicts the doctrine of the universal will of grace and others. God can not contradict himself. Therefore, the doctrine he found is really not a doctrine of the Word of God but must be false, and the passage which seems to contain it, must be explained so that it is not in contradiction to others. If he can not find such an explanation, let him wait until, by the grace of God, he does find it. Think of Chiliasm! It seems to be found in Rev. 20. Scriptures seem to teach in this passage that, before the day of judgment, Christ will appear upon earth and reign with the Saints one thousand years. Why do we reject this doctrine, which some believe they have found in this chapter? Because it is in contradiction to other doctrines. Our reason which is enlightened by the Holy Spirit can not, without being disloyal to the Spirit, and denying other truths, find a place for this doctrine in the structure of Christian faith. This doctrine is not in harmony with other parts of that structure. If we would place it into that structure we would disturb other parts and get the whole building out of shape. Therefore, we consider this doctrine an error, and try to find a different explanation of the passage which seems to contain it. The analogy of faith must be applied whenever we have to determine whether a

doctrine, seemingly contained in the Word of God, is really taught in Scriptures or not.

In the first article of the Formula of Concord, we have a striking example of how our Lutheran Church wishes this to be done, and does it itself in determining the correct doctrine concerning original sin. Some theologians of the Augsburg Confession taught "that since the fall, the nature, substance, and essence of corrupt man is original sin itself," and "that there is no difference whatever between the nature or essence of man and original sin." They believed that the following Scripture passages contained this doctrine: John 3, 6; Rom. 6, 6; Col. 3, 9; 1 John 3, 4. What does our Lutheran Church do with this doctrine, seemingly contained in these passages? It rejects it most emphatically. On what grounds? It does not quote a single Scripture passage which should prove *expressis verbis* that this doctrine concerning original sin is false. Apparently, it does not know of any. Nevertheless, it rejects it because this doctrine is not in harmony with the analogy of faith. If our Church would place this doctrine in the structure of divine truth it would disturb the most essential parts of that structure. Knowing this, it says: "A distinction must be observed between our nature and original sin which dwells in nature; these two according to the Holy Scriptures must and can be considered, taught and believed, with their proper distinction. *The principal articles of our Christian faith urge and enforce the observance of this distinction,*" namely the articles of faith concerning creation, redemption, sanctification and resurrection. If original sin is the nature, substance and essence of man, God has created sin; Christ has assumed it; the Holy Spirit baptizes and sanctifies, and saves it, yea he will at the last day raise up original sin. "Hence it is clear that this doctrine, with all the opinions which are dependent and consequent upon it, must be rejected. . . For the principal articles of our Christian faith testify forcibly and powerfully as to the reasons for which a difference between the nature and substance of man . . . and sin itself . . shall and must be retained."

Frank says (Theologie der Concordienformel I, 66): "The Confessions prove (that original sin is not the substance and essence of man) *in a characteristically Lutheran manner by the analogy of faith,* showing that their doctrine concerning original sin contradicts the three articles of the *Symbolum Apostolicum* in which the distinction of man and sin dwelling in man, is presupposed and included." The analogy of faith is to our Lutheran Fathers the sole guide and the sole and infallible rule according to which they determine whether this doctrine concerning original sin, seemingly found in Scriptures, is divine truth or human error. Finding it not in harmony with but contrary to the analogy of faith they reject it, and give the passages wherein others believed that they found it, an interpretation which is in harmony with the analogy of faith.

Furthermore, the *analogia fidei* or *regula fidei* must determine the exegesis of all Scripture passages. We must take it for granted that no author of sound reason contradicts himself. If a sentence in his book seems to be dark and is not understood readily we have to explain it according to the teachings and opinions of the author as set forth in other parts of his book. If an author who teaches that the earth revolves around the sun, would say: The sun arose, I would not be justified in accusing him of changing his view or contradicting himself, but I would have to say, that he speaks according to the usual custom. If I would find the sentence: Whosoever is not a child can not be baptized, in the book of a Baptist, I would not be justified in saying that he changed his doctrine or contradicts himself, but I must say that he speaks of those who are children spiritually. If a Unitarian says: Jesus is the Son of God, I must say: He does not mean that Jesus is the Son of God according to his essence, but that he is the Son of God in an ethical sense. If Calvin says: In the Lord's Supper we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, I can not say: He has become a Lutheran, but must explain his words according to the doctrine which he teaches of the Lord's Supper. I must say: He means, eat and drink Christ's body and blood

by faith. Every author must be interpreted according to his own views as set forth in the plain passages of his book, and we must *a priori* take it for granted that he does not contradict himself. Still, he may contradict himself, and how many do! Human authors err, and often their books are full of contradictions. One author, however, never errs, and this author's book does not and can not contain a single contradiction. This author is the Holy Spirit, and his book is the Bible. This book is infallible. Therefore, if we want to find the true sense of those Scripture passages which are dark to us and difficult to understand — and Christ tells us to search the Scriptures — we must explain them according to the clear passages, i. e., according to the analogy of faith. If the interpretation of a Scripture passage agrees with the analogy of faith it may be correct. It is not necessarily correct. It may be that the true sense of that passage is still another which we have not found as yet. But this interpretation, not being in contradiction to other Scripture passages, we can bear and accept until by the grace of God we find something better. The analogy of faith must be applied in interpreting all Scripture passages which need an interpretation, and is a safeguard against all errors.

We proceed to our fourth question, to-wit:

IV.

The analogy of faith theory — according to the Missouri conception of it — applied in doctrine and interpretation of the Scriptures, to what will it lead? In what respects does the Missouri Synod differ from us in regard to the analolgy of faith? The Missourians deny that the Christian doctrine is a system of truth; they call it a collection of truths. They claim each doctrine of Scripture has an alanogy of its own. It is to be found in its *sedes doctrinae.* Whatever they teach *expressisverbis* of a doctrine is its analogy, and all teaching on our part with respect to a certain doctrine must be in accord with the analogy of that doctrine. If one doctrine seems to be in contradiction to the other, and I do not succeed in

bringing them into harmony on a Scriptural basis, I must believe both doctrines and declare: Here is a mystery which I can not solve. Whilst we maintain that the Christian faith is one harmonious whole, and each part of this faith, i. e., each doctrine must be in full harmony with the others, and can not contradict any other, the Missourians claim that each individual doctrine has an analogy of its own, and if the analogies of two doctrines which we find in the *sedes doctrinae* are seemingly in contradiction to each other we must submit our reason to the word of God, and believe both doctrines. This principle carried out, to what will it lead? Missouri's doctrine of predestination shows it, although it is our conviction that this false doctrine of predestination is the cause of their error in regard to the analogy of faith. Here, however, is their principle applied. Missouri teaches two seemingly *contradictorias voluntates in Deo,* the universal will of grace and the particular will of election. It maintains that there can not be any analogy between the two. We must believe both, although we can not harmonize them, but must confess that they seem to be in contradiction to each other. I must believe that it is really God's earnest desire to save all men through faith in Christ who has wrought an atonement for all. And I must believe that God has elected only a few, according to a rule which is a mystery to us, that they should come to Christ and believe in him to the end. The universal will of grace embraces all men, the particular grace of election which is the cause of persevering faith and without which nobody can come to persevering faith and be saved embraces only the elect. One excludes the other, but I must believe both. Pray, in which one should I put my trust and the hope of my salvation? In the universal grace which embraces all or in the particular which embraces only the elect, and which alone can finally save? And if in the latter, how do I know whether the latter really includes me? If the Missourians follow their principle in regard to the analogy of faith, other errors will and must soon creep into their doctrines. Let me illustrate this principle and its results by referring to the doctrine of

justification. St. Paul says: We are saved by faith, without works. St. James says: Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only. Here are two seemingly contradictory statements. What must a Missourian do if he wishes to carry out his principle? He must say: "In the first passage the Holy Spirit teaches justification by faith, in the second justification by works. I am not permitted to harmonize these two statements with my reason. Reason has no business to try it. Here is a mystery which I am unable to solve. I must believe both. Yea, I believe that I am justified by faith, and I believe that I am justified by my works." Pray, wherein should I now place my trust and the hope of my salvation? In the grace of God and the merits of Christ, or in my own works? Or in both? Wherein shall I find comfort? Or take the doctrine of the Person of Christ. Scriptures declare: Christ is God. Christ himself says: "I and my father are one," and again: "My father is greater than I." Here are two statements, seemingly contradicting each other. It is not the business of human reason to try to harmonize them. I must submit to the word of God. Here is a mystery which I can not solve. I must believe both. Yea, I believe that Christ is God, the second person of the Trinity, one with the Father and equal with him, and I believe that the father, the first person of the Godhead is greater than he. Or take the doctrine of Chiliasm. Scriptures teach: The Church is invisible according to its essence. It will be subject to sufferings to the end. Christ will appear on the day of judgment and deliver it. In Rev. 20 we find the statement that the saints lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The doctrine of the Chiliasts who maintain that before the resurrection of the dead and the final judgment takes place, Christ will come to earth and reign with the saints a thousand years, seems to be implied here. What must the Missourians do, according to their principle? They must say: "Here are two statements which apparently contradict each other. Human reason has no right to try to harmonize them. Here is a mystery. We submit our reason to the Word of God

and believe both truths. Yea, I believe that Christ will not return to earth until the day of judgment, and that until the day of judgment the Church will be subject to sufferings and persecutions on the part of the world. And I believe that Christ will return before the day of judgment, and that He will reign in glory with His Church one thousand years." I could furnish other examples. I could show how the whole Christian faith is torn asunder, and a miserable chaos of contradicting doctrines if this Missouri principle was true and carried out logically to its full extent. The principle maintained by Missouri of to-day opens the doors to all false doctrines and errors. The harmony of divine truth is destroyed if this principle is correct. We hold fast to the old Lutheran principle of the analogy of faith. It has been a true guide and a safeguard against all errors in every doctrinal strife which the Lutheran Church had to wage. The analogy of faith is one of our weapons against the error of Modern Missouri in predestination. It will remain the weapon of the Church against every error even unto the end. The Holy Spirit admonishes us: "I exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Missouri's false doctrine concerning predestination has led it to a false doctrine concerning conversion. It has led it to a false doctrine concerning the analogy of faith, a doctrine which is something entirely new in our Lutheran Church. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." What next?

PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT IN ITS BEARING ON THEOLOGY—A LECTURE.*

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D, COLUMBUS, O.

A glance at the list of speakers and subjects for this course of lectures suggests the thought that to the present

*Delivered on the evening of March 14th as one of the regular winter course of lectures under the auspices of the Philosophical Society of the Ohio State University and prepared for a non-theological academic audience.

lecturer has been assigned the role of a Saul among the prophets. A man whose weaknesses are evidently for Hebrew roots or the Greek verb in *mi* or possibly even for theological polemics is almost a curiosity in a company which regards the investigation of the phenomena of nature as the *non plus ultra* of scientific scholarship. Indeed as far at least as theology is concerned it is commonly considered that between it and the natural sciences there exists a never ending contest, a chronic feline and canine antagonism. It is just for this reason, however, that it is a good thing for representatives of these two spheres of research occasionally to compare notes and see exactly what the *status controversiae* really is. There probably never was a time when conferences of this kind between scholars in the different lines of investigation were more necessary than is now the case, and yet the tendency is not toward but opposed to such communion of thought. This is the age of specialization in scholarly research, and it is such naturally and necessarily. The sciences have been mulitplied, and divided and subdivided, that the seven sciences of the Middle Ages have probably developed into almost so many hundred, and no encyclopoedia or methodology of the sciences could present a complete and orderly scheme. In fact no man knows how many sciences there actually are; and he is a fortunate mortal who knows the names and purpose of those in his own larger field of investigation. As a result the ground which even the most gifted and industrious scholar can cover thoroughly is very small. A man can be an authority only in some sub- or sub-sub-division of the field which he cultivates. The days of polymathy, in which practically all this scientifically knowable was within the grasp of a single master mind, are over. Men like an Aristotle or a Leibnitz are in our times an impossibility. Cosmopolitanism is greater in the scientific world than ever before, even greater than it was when the Latin language as the sacred tongue of scholarship formed the international means of communication, of exchange and interchange of investigation between the savants of the different peoples. It is not likely that any particular

kind of research will be duplicated in our day because the scholar of one nation does not know what his co-worker in another has been or is doing. But all this only makes a sharp specialization in scholarship more imperative. Quite naturally this condition of affairs is not an unmixed good. One of the results is that even the best scholar in one department is necessarily ignorant of the real work or its worth done in another. What he knows from other than his own little world he accepts on the authority of others, and authority has probably never before exercised a greater influence in the learned world than is the case at present. Another consequence is that even the good specialist in one line can have only superficial knowledge in other departments, since he has his knowledge only at second hand or from secondary sources. Worst of all is the fact that because he is busily engaged in digging one little hole, deeply though it be, and sees only the little speck of heaven from the bottom of his hole, he is apt to think there is nothing in the heavens except what his limited vision permits him to see. It is exceedingly difficult for a genuine modern scholar to view the work of the learned world in general from the correct perspective. He can scarcely help but be prejudiced in favor of the methods and manner, the principles and the canons that obtain in the little world in which he lives and moves and has his being and be narrow-minded and uncharitable toward others and to imagine that all other ways are false and unscientific. Facts like these, which any thinking person with only an elementary knowledge of psychology, human nature or the modern world will at once recognize as correct, suggest the wisdom of having the representatives of different lines of research meet for conference and exchange of views. There is no lack of learned congresses and conventions, local, national and international in our days, but these are all of men and women working along the same lines. What the Germans have in those courses of lectures which at the universities are offered "for the students of *all* the faculties" is needed in the learned world

in general. Our day is indeed one of deep scholarship but not of wide and broad scholarship. That is yet a *pium desiderium.*

Particularly it is not a work of supererogation to outline the relation that exists between theology and philosophic and scientific thought. Whether there is a real conflict between the two is itself a matter of debate. The existence of such a conflict is however rather generally accepted and a number of the leading colleges and universities in this country under the auspices of conservative churches have established special professorships of the Harmony between Science and Religion, of which institutions Princeton and Oberlin are prominent examples. As a rude it is the philosophic side of the house that claims that there is such a conflict, while the ecclesiastical side maintains that, if both religion and science are properly interpreted, there cannot be any essential opposition, since the Revelation in Nature, coming as it does from the same source that gives the Revelation in the Scriptures, cannot in the nature of things contradict the latter. The difficulty accordingly does not lie in the object or objects, but in the subjects who study these objects. However, Ambassador White's volume on the Conflict between Science and Religion was not the first nor will it be the last volume written on this subject. It is more than doubtful if ever a harmonious relation satisfactory to all concerned will be established. The problem of religion and science, of the *pistis* and the *gnosis,* of reason and revelation, of the natural and the supernatural, of the teachings of the senses and the transcendental, really represent two worlds of thought, both of which maintain that their *raison d ê tre,* their right of existence, is based upon principles over which the other has no control or jurisdiction. If it has once been established that either religion or reason has the sole right to decide all questions of truth, or if exact demarcation lines have been drawn between the spheres where the one is supreme and the other is without authority, then a way to peace and harmony has been found. But if both religion

and reason each considers itself the measure of all things and the last court of appeals, the prospects of reaching an understanding are not any too bright.

Without doubt or debate both philosophy and theology as the expression of the religion of the Scriptures, have in times past, each been guilty of trespassing upon the legitimate domains of the other. There was a time when the latter regarded it as its right to condemn the Copernican system of astronomy, instead of making use of the new discoveries in the phenomena of nature to understand better the teachings of the Scriptures; but there can be no doubt that the inroads of science or philosophy on theology have been much more frequent and persistent. There has scarcely been any new school of radical theology within the last century which is not the outcome of an attempt to fit the teachings of the Scriptures to the Procrustian bed of some philosophical scheme. In the immediate present there are evidences of this at all hands. The Higher Criticism of the Old and New Testaments, in the radical meaning of the term, is nothing else than the application of an extreme evolutionary philosophy to the contents of the Scriptures. As the elder Delitzsch said: "We are living in the era of the religion of Darwin." Harnack's Essence of Christianity is substantially the naturalistic philosophy of the day applied to the supernatural contents of the Bible. The Babel-Bible controversy, which has called forth 100,000 of the younger Delitzsch's addresses, and at least 50 "Replies," of all kinds. conditions and colors, is nothing but the applications of the teachings put forth in the name of a natural history of the development of religion in general to the religion of the Scriptures claimed by themselves to be a revelation, and hence not the natural development of thought and reason. In the conflict between theology and science, theology has been much more sinned against than sinning, and this is the case now even to a greater degree than ever before. It is useless to deny the fact that over against the claims of the Natural Sciences theology has for a generation been on the defensive, not because there is any real reason for this,

but largely because of the timidity of the theologians and the arrogance of the scientists, the latter of whom, in many cases in this day and generation are not afflicted with a superabundance of modesty but understand the *rationale* of all things and of a few more, and are more ready to draw hasty conclusions than any other group of scholars.

In attempting to determine more closely what the bearings of philosophic thought on religion are and can and ought to be, it is of course at once granted that the formal use of reason or philisophical thought in the domain of theology is necessary. No matter whence theology may draw its materials, be this from natural or from supernatural sources, it can not develop these into a science without philosophy, without logic, without reason. Theology is not a system given as such in the Scriptures or in any other place; the science must be constructed; the relation of the parts determined and a harmonious structure effected. Theology like any other science depends upon philosophy, on the laws of thought as a means and as instruments to give it scientific form and shape.

But how about the *material* use of reason or philosophy in theology? Can the human mind be depended upon to furnish theology with its higher or highest concepts or give it the fundamental and essential principles and truths with which it operates? This is the heart of the problem before us; it is the central question in the whole discussion; and to this question we unhesitatingly answer, No! It is certain that some of the materials with which theology must operate can be the product of rational thought, certain elementary concepts, such as the omnipotence or even the wisdom of God are within the scope of the thought development of the mind. There is such a thing as a Natural Theology. The revelation of God in nature and in man is a phenomenon directly taught by the Scriptures, especially by Paul in Romans, and is also one of the plainest lessons of secular science and history. But here we are dealing with higher and deeper concepts, such as the Scriptures distinctly declare to be the product of revelation, such as pertain to the real

nature of God, to His relation to the world and the principles that actuate Him in His government of the world and of men, to those truths that come into play when it is a matter of satisfying the religious wants and needs of men. In other words: Can reason or philosophy — which two are practically identical for our purpose — supply us with a religion upon which we can live and die? Again the answer must be, No!

And why is this the case? In one word, it is because the limitations of philosophy are so great and the certainty it furnishes so uncertain that the religious instincts of man, even if they have not been yet developed by actual experience with the principles of the Gospel, cannot be satisfied with even the best that philosophy can furnish it in this respect. A purely rationalistic religion can satisfy only a superficial mind and heart. The deepest interests and emotions in man are the religious, stronger than the ties of language, nationality, or even of family. Every man is born with a religion; it is as natural for him to have a religion, to feel that he stands in some connection with and in some dependence on a Higher Being, as it is for him to breathe, or to eat or to drink. Augustin, who knew the strong and the weak sides of philosophy if ever a man knew them, utters a great truth when he says: "Tu fecisti nos ad te, itaque cor nostrum inquietum est in nobis denec requiescat in te." The Psalmist's words: "The *fool* sayeth in his heart: there is no God," is one of the deepest truths that man ever penned, fully confirmed by history and psychology. And to satisfy these longings and instincts all the teachings of philosophy do not suffice. There is still something lacking, and that is essential and fundamental. The highest and deepest concepts of theology, especially a Christian theology based on the Scriptures, are of a kind that are above the intellectual power of man to understand. They are not subject to these laws, as little as their origin and genesis can be explained by these laws. Even going no further than the fundamental idea of a *benign* and a *gracious* God, which lies at the bottom of the whole system of Christian theology, it is evident at

a glance that this is the product of some other power than that of philosophical research. And going through the whole system of Biblical thought we meet with exactly the same state of affairs. To say that the very fact that these are not the product of rational thought is a proof that they are not real, is nothing but begging the question, on the supposition that the intellectual faculties are the only ones that furnish us knowledge or ideas. We know thousands of things by processes different from those of the intellectual faculties and which we cannot accordingly demonstrate to others, to be correct or incorrect by the use of these faculties. All the arguments in the world cannot *prove* to a man that the rose is red; this he must know by other means than reason or the related powers of the mind. No amount of proof can *demonstrate* that the Niagara Falls are a sublime picture. If a man knows this at all he knows it through other agencies than his intellectual powers. All the rhetoric and logic in the world cannot do this. It is a mistaken idea that the scientific work of the day is one that is not based on any presuppositions, that it can be controlled from beginning to end, step by step, by the activity of the intellectual faculties. The hypothesis of an *absolute Voraussetzungslosikeit,* of starting with absolutely *no* presupposition, from no standpoint that is *assumed* and *not proven*, is a dream. Some months ago, when the appointment of a distinctively *Catholic* professor of history to the University of Strassburg, namely Dr. Spahn, aroused the concern of the academic critics in Germany and called forth the famous circular letter of Mommsen in the interests of academic freedom of research and scholarship, that cornerstone of the German University system, Mommsen himself declared that a science without any presuppositions was unthinkable, and the acceptance of views and conditions on other grounds than those of intellectual processes was particularly justified in Theology. Take such conceptions as Trinity, Atonement, the Person and Works of Christ, and it appears at once how impossible it is for philosophical thought to pass on the merits or demerits of the problems involved. There are so many

things that we do not dream of in our philosophy that are realities more firmly established in the hearts and minds of men than any thing that philosophic thought can furnish, that it is arrogance on the part of the intellectual side of man to pretend to sit in judgment on anything that we are to know or believe. In general, too, thinking men recognize the fact that religious thoughts and convictions must be based on other sources than the intellectual faculties. A man's religion is practically never the result of his *thinking*, however much his thinking may modify the forms of his religious beliefs. It is not the head but the heart that dictates to a man what he really believes and upon what he puts his trust. Here to a greater degree than elsewhere the old principle "Credo, ut intelligam" has its legitimate place and function. The German philosopher Jacobi was wont to say that he was a believer with his heart and a rationalist with his head. This case is typical and representative. A system of purely rationalistic religion can never satisfy permanently; it is essentially superficial because it can explain so little and leaves so many riddles and enigmas, the solution of which it can never touch. No rationalistic religious creed has ever done more than merely outlive the generation that produced it. This is true of the English Deists, the French Encyclopædists of the "Vulgar Rationalism" of Germany, and seemingly is proving true of radical Darwinism.

Whence the mind can get the religious concepts which it requires and which philosophy cannot furnish is another question, and one that does not directly concern us in this discussion. Suffice it that theology is fully convinced that it has these concepts and ideas and that they are realities and the truth, even if it has not applied at the bar of philosophical thought to secure them. It deals with matter which reason cannot touch and theology not pretend to *prove* its positions in the ordinary sense of the term. Even such a fundamental problem as that of the Inspiration of the Scriptures cannot be *proved*, is not an object of logic or historical demonstration. All the recent finds made in the cuneiform literatures of Assyria and Babylonia and in the hieroglyphics

of Egypt cannot *prove* that the Scriptures are inspired. This is an object of faith, as are all the doctrines in a theological system that are transcendental in character. Whence theology may get its certainty is a problem by itself; suffice it here that for its highest and deepest and most fundamental materials it must go elsewhere than to philosophy.

Then, in the next place, philosophy cannot supply that degree and kind of certainty that religious convictions need, the kind that for the person involved is raised above any doubt or debate. Philosophy and science can deal only with the phenomena that fall under the observation of man and can deal with only what it sees and hears and feels. It observes that certain causes produce certain effects; and when these causes have been noticed to have produced these results a greater number of times — how often is a matter of doubt —, science declares that it has discovered a law of nature. In reality all it has done is that it has recorded the sequence of certain causes and their results, but it cannot and does not know that absolutely these same causes will produce these same results again. The Scientist *believes* that is the case, and upon this *belief*, this faith, he acts. But unless he has observed absolutely each and every one of the individual phenomena that belong to the case he has under consideration, he cannot say and dare not say that the law he has discovered is absolutely certain. The element of uncertainty and doubt is not yet removed and the certainty he offers cannot aspire to the dignity of a moral conviction removed above all doubt to an apodictic truth. Professor Nathusius, of the University of Greifswald, in his work "Das Wesen der Wissenschaft," correctly says, that no law based on the induction method can be regarded as absolutely true until the opposite of it has been demonstrated to be impossible. True it is that in very many cases man acts and must act on the presupposition that this stage of certainty has been reached, but what he does from these premises are really acts of faith. When the engineer pulls the throttle of his engine he does so because he *believes* that the same causes that have produced the

effect of moving his locomotive through space before will be operative again. He lives by faith and not by sight. When the farmer plows his field and sows his wheat he does so because, having observed that wheat under these conditions will reproduce itself and multiply, he hopes that the same will prove true in this case. His deed is an act of faith and not of knowledge. Indeed all scientific principles based on induction and deducted from observed phenomena of nature are merely so many articles of a scientific creed. The laws of nature as formulated by science are merely confessions of faith. Really the regular science man ought to be a model Christian. He needs faith at every step and cannot take a step without this faith, that he is the last one who ought to object because the Christian System demands this same thing. In reality the remarkable thing is not *how much* we know about things but *how little.* We know a certain sequence of cause and effect and that is all. Our knowledge is not even skin-deep; it is all on the surface. We cannot even penetrate into the *nexus,* into the *because,* that exists between cause and effect, nor exercise the least control over either. The *Ignoramus et Ignorabimus* of Virchow is really characteristic of our actual knowledge of the things with which science must deal.

It is deeply significant that it is just the most famous Naturalists who concede and teach the limitations of scientific research. No one has done this more candidly than that prince of savants, Professor Virchow, of Berlin. And that he did so not out of any theological bias is more evident from his well-known hostility to Christianity. His words that he had handled the dissecting knife for a life time and had never found the evidences of an immortal soul, are as well known as they are characteristic of the man. In his famous Munich address as President of the International Congress of Scientists, which has become a classic of its kind, he closes with these words:

Over against the riddles of the physical world the naturalist has long ago learned to confess in a manly way his

"Ignoramus." * * * Over against the riddles as to what matter and power are, and how he is to think them, he once for all must join in the confession so hard to make, which says "Ignorabimus."

It was in this address too that Virchow condemned as unscientific the claims of advanced Darwinism, as advocated by Haeckel who demanded that it be taught in the public schools of Germany; and at almost every meeting of the Congress he pointed to this scheme as an example of science falsely so called.

Equally open in the recognition of the limitations, restrictions and uncertainty of scientific conclusions was du Bois-Reymoud, also of the Berlin University, especially over against the classics of a Haeckel. Tyndall's conservative sentiments in this regard, as expressed in his "Fragments" so impressed Helmholtz, that he caused this work to be translated into German.

Processes of this sort and philosophic thought under these conditions cannot furnish anything like apodictic certainty, especially when it is remembered that only too often does a minimum of fact suffice to construe a maximum of hypothesis, a phenomenal return in theories for the slightest investment of fact; and that a geologist needs only to find some half-decayed bone in some unusual stratum to add unlimited periods to the age of the world; and if one bone can do such great things, what would not a whole carcass accomplish — witness the Cardiff giant. True we need those kind of men as pioneers in every department of science, who strike out boldly with the slightest of pretexts. These men are usually pathfinders for the more conservative investigators who make haste more slowly and tread more cautiously. It is for such reasons that the so-called "sure results" of scientific research must generally be taken *cum grano salis.* The sure results of one generation sometimes becomes the laughing stock of the next, and this not only in the details but in the fundamentals and essentials. There is no doubt that the idea of development has been one of the most prolific of good, and,

not to be forgotten, also of bad results, in the research of all departments of learning. And yet in its extreme phase it is meeting with the fate of nearly all radical thought, which as a rule consists in the exaggeration and abuse of a kernel of truth underlying the theory. The extreme type of Darwinism, the radical philosophy that would claim to be the final philosophy on the ground of a natural evolution, is, at least as far as Germany is concerned, practically a dying issue. In that land of "authors and thinkers" (Dichter und Denker), naturalists almost to a man have turned against this kind of Darwinism. Dr. Dennert, the greatest among the living Christian scientists of Germany, in his recent work "Vom Totenbett des Darwinismus" (From the Deathbed of Darwinism) gives an amazing list, with liberal quotations from many of the leading scientists of Germany, declaring that Evolution as the final philosophy of all things, is a thing of the past. The most interesting contribution to this problem, and the latest, is the new work of the veteran philosopher of "The Unconscious," Edward von Hartmann, who is anything but a Christian, as is seen from his famous work "Die Selbstzersetzung des Christentums" (The Selfintegration of Christianity); yet in his recent discussion on "Die Abstammungslehre seit Darwin," declares that since about 1890 Darwinism had been losing ground at a phenomenal rate among the naturalists of the Continent, and thinks that the first decade of the twentieth century will bury it permanently. Virtually there is only one naturalist of prominence in Germany, the veteran Haeckel, of Jena, the *alter Ego* of the English scholar, and one who still adheres to radical evolution, and whose "Worldriddles" of three or more years ago, far from solving the riddles of existence on the bases of an advanced evolution, added only one new riddle, namely the phenomenal ignorance in all other departments of a man who in his special department of zoology has done much good work. In England too there seems to be a move in the same direction. The new work of Darwin's contemporary and co-discoverer of the Origin of Species, Alfred R.

Wallace, "Man's Place in the Universe" really undertakes a rehabilitation of the Ptolemaic cosmogany on its philosophical as opposed to its purely astronomical side. At the funeral of Herbert Spencer, his friend and pupil Leonard Courtney spoke these words:

> "The brain so full and so powerful has ceased to act. There is no longer any manifestation of consciousness. Can consciousness survive after the organ on which it depended has ceased to be? Is the personality that dwelt in this poor frame to be admitted as in itself indestructible? Or must we acquiesce in its reabsorption in the infinite, the everabiding, the ineffable energy of which it was a passing spark? If indestructible in the future, must it not have been as incapable of coming into existence as it is incapable of ceasing to be? Our master knew not. He could not tell. The last enigma defies our question. The dimensions of the unknown may be reduced through successive ages, but compared with our slender discoveries, estimated at the best, a vastness that remains must ever overawe us. Some fringes of the unknowable may yet prove to be capable of being known, but the great central secret lies beyond our apprehension."

The great founder of modern scientific methods and manners, Lord Bacon, himself clearly recognizes the principle that the certainty of all of our knowledge cannot come from the domain of the intellect. One of the characteristic utterances in his Organon is found in these words: *"Omnis scientia duplicem sortitus informationem; una inspiratur divinitus, altera oritur a semen,"* in which is particularly to be noted that the *divinitus* comes first. In this connection another quotation from the father of modern scientific research is in place, his words being these: "It is true that a little philosophy inclineth men to atheism, but depth of philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon secondary causes scattered: it may sometimes rest in them and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of these confederate, and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity."

Outside of the sphere of pure mathematics scientific research cannot offer any absolute certainty, and in mathematics the ground of the certainty lies in the objects and

not in the powers of mind that study these objects. Two and two would be four, even if there were only one example of two and two in all the world. But as soon as we enter the sphere of deductive reasoning, when from observation of individuals we deduct general laws, the certainty is only relative and never can be absolute, not even in the commonest phenomena of nature. Huxley, asked if he believed that the sun would rise tomorrow, answered that he did; when asked if it would rise a thousand years from tomorrow, declared that he could not tell; and yet if scientific laws drawn by deductive processes are so absolutely reliable, then the one ought to have been as sure as the other. Men have declared that it is impossible that Jesus Christ were born of a virgin because they had never known the birth of a human being except by the ordinary union of man and woman. The only conclusion they are justified in making is that the observation in the cases of millions or billions of men has shown that here there has never been any departure from the ordinary process, but this does not prove that this could and would not take place. Science has no right to deny the possibility of a miracle. It may not have observed a miracle and it may declare this; but this is the extent of its wisdom. All of its deductions must in the nature of the case end with an interrogation mark.

Whence theology gets a higher degree of certainty is for theology to answer and does not directly concern us here. The importance and difficulty of the problem theology has learned fully to appreciate, and this is one of the great living problems of theological discussion and debate. Whether this certainty be found objectively in the Scriptures; or subjectively in the Christian consciousness; in the "Historical Christ;" or, as the Catholics teach, in the authority of the church; — suffice it, that theology is convinced that it has this certainty and has it from other sources than philosophical thought.

In conclusion we give a summary of this discussion in the following six propositions:

I. The terms philosophical thought and theology are

here taken in their currently accepted meanings, the former referring to the constructive and systematic work of the intellectual powers, the latter to the system of teachings taken from the Scriptures.

II. The *formal* use of philosophical thought in theology is necessary and welcome as it is in the construction of any science.

III. The *material* use of reason or philosophical thought in theology is confined to those elementary matters that by their very nature belong to what is called Natural Theology.

IV. The higher and deeper concepts and ideas of theology cannot be drawn from philosophy, which by its very nature and limitations cannot supply this material. Theology looks to Revelation as the source of these truths and must by process of its own, independent of philosophy, be able to furnish the evidence for the reality of these ideas and concepts.

V. As reasoning by the inductive method cannot furnish anything like moral certainty as to its conclusions, theology must look to other sources than the processes and work of the intellectual faculties for that certainty which alone can satisfy in matters of religion, of the soul and of the spirit, and must be able to furnish from other sources than philosophy the grounds of its faith.

VI. A conflict between philosophical thought and theology is possible only when the one trespasses on the sphere and functions of the other, or when the limitations of either are ignored.

SOME EARLY LUTHERAN HYMNBOOKS.

BY E. F. DAUME, PITTSBURG, PA.

In the year 1524 there appeared in print a thin pamphlet of only twelve leaves in quarto form; it contained only eight hymns, four by Dr. Luther, three by Dr. Paul Speratus, and one by an author unknown.

This is the so-called "Acht Lieder Buch" and marks the beginning of our Lutheran hymnody. The full title as

printed in the old German black letter text of the early sixteenth century, reads thus:

> "Etlich christlich lider, Lobgesang, und Psalm, dem rainen Wort Gottes gemesz, aus der heyligen schrift, durch mancherley hochgelehrter gemacht, in der Kirchen zu singen. Wie es dann zum tayl berayt zu Wittenberg in Uebung ist. Wittenberg M. D. xiiij."

Wackernagel, who describes the book very minutely in his "Bibliographie zur Geschichte des Deutschen Kirchenliedes" No. CXXIX, expresses the opinion that it was printed at Nuremburg, notwithstanding the imprint on the title page. The date 1514 is evidently an error, since this would make the book antedate Luther's break with Rome. Besides this, two of the hymns are dated 1523 and later editions bear the date of 1524 which, as all authorities agree, is the correct date.

So far as known there are only three copies of the original edition in existence; but of the later editions, having the date and other typographical errors corrected, quite a number of copies are still extant, all but a very few however are in the possession of public libraries in Germany.

The eight hymns which it contained were printed in the following order:

1. Nun freut euch lieben Christengemein.
2. Es ist das heil uns komen her.
3. In Gott gelaub ich das er hat.
4. Hilf Gott wie ist der Menschen Not.
5. Ach Gott vom Himmel sieh darein.
6. Es spricht der unweisen mund wol.
7. Aus tiefer not schrei ich zu dir.
8. In Jesu namen heben wir an.

The first, fifth, sixth, and seventh, were written by Dr. Luther. The second, third, and fourth by Dr. Speratus, while the authorship of the last remains unknown. Under the first and second hymns appears the date 1523. There are four melodies printed with the hymns, viz., one each to the first, second, third and eighth; with the fifth is

printed the same melody as that of the second, while with the sixth and seventh hymns references are given to the melody of the second and fifth. No melody is provided for the fourth hymn. The first and second are the only melodies that are still in use, and were substantially the same as found in Layritz "Choral Buch" under the respective first lines of the hymns.

The year 1524 saw the appearance of two other Lutheran Hymnals, viz: The so-called "Erfurter Enchiridion" which contained twenty-five hymns and fifteen melodies; eighteen of the hymns being Luther's, one "Wo Gott der Herr nicht by uns hält," by Justus Jonas, one, "Herr Christ der einig Gott's Sohn," by Elizabeth Creutziger, and one, "Erbarm dich mein, O Herre Gott," by Erhart Hegenwalt. There were also the three hymns by Dr. Speratus, already published in the "Acht Lieder Buch," as well as the last hymn of that first collection. Wackernagel supposes this book to have been published by Dr. Jonas, assisted by Johannes Lange. It was in small octavo form with the following full title in Gothic text.

> Ein Enchiridion oder Handbuchlein, eynem ytzlichen Christen fast nützlich bey sich zuhaben. Zur stetter ubung und trachtung geystlicher gesenge und Psalmen. Rechtschaffen und Kunstlich verteuscht. M. CCCCC.-xxiiij.
>
> Am ende dieses Büchleins wirst du fynden eyn Register, yn wilchem klerlich angetzeigt ist, was und wie vill Gesenge hieryn begryffen synd.
>
> Mit dysen und der gleichen Gesenge sollt man bilbyllich die yungen yugend auffertziehen.

On the last page appeared the imprint.

> Gedruckt zu Erffurd, yn der Permenter gassen. Zum Ferbefasz MDXXIIII.

The first and second pages were taken up by a preface beginning,

> "Unter vielen miszbreuchen bisher durch vill hochgelahrter und erfahrner der heyligen geschrifft antzeiget, yst freylich ym grundt der Wahrheit, dyser nicht der ge-

> ringsten eyner, welche unser Tempelknecht, und des Teuffels Corales, für Gottes dynst hoch aufgeputzt habe. Alş nemlich, das sye allein den gantze Tag ym chor gestanden seyn und nach artt der Priester Baal mit undeutlichen geschreiy gebrüllet haben, und noch in stifft Kirchen und Klöstern brullen, wie der Walt esel, zu einem tauben Gott."

Zahn in his "Die Melodien der Deutschen Ev. Kirchenlieder" is authority for the statement that the only copy of this book in existence until recent years, was in the public library at Strassburg and was burned in 1870. Fortunately, Dr. Wackernagel in 1848 had the book reprinted in facsimile, of which quite a number of copies were made and distributed.

This Enchiridion seems to have been twice reprinted at Erfurt in the same year. These editions contained the same hymns but arranged in a different order and one of them (probably the last) contained an additional melody.

The other Hymn book of this year (1524) was Johann Walther's "Geystliche Gesangk Büchlein." It was printed at Wittenberg and was the product of the combined efforts of Dr. Luther and Johann Walther the "Cantor" at the court of Frederick the wise at Torgau. Walther was during this year for three weeks with Luther at Wittenberg for the purpose of assisting in the preparation of a German Liturgical service, and which appeared later in the year.

The "Gesangk Büchlein" was primarily intended for use as a text-book in the instruction of the children in church music. The tunes were set to five voices: viz. first and second tenor, discant, alto and bass, the melody being in the first tenor voice.

This book contained thirty-two hymns set to thirty-eight tunes — four of the hymns having two melodies each and one having three melodies. There are also five Latin hymns. The twenty-four hymns which Luther contributed to this collection were, in addition to those in the "Acht Lieder Buch," the following:

1. Nun bitten wir den Heil'gen Geist.
2. Komm Heil'ger Geist, Herre Gott.

3. Gott sey gelobet und gebenedeiet.
4. Mitten wir im leben sind.
5. Ein neues lied wir heben an.
6. Christ lag in todesbanden.
7. Es wollt uns Gott genädich sein.
8. Das sind die Heil'gen Zehn Gebot.
9. Mensch willst du leben seliglich.
10. Nun kommt der heiden Heiland.
11. Christum wir sollen loben schon.
12. Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ.
13. Jesus Christus unser Heiland
    der von uns Gottes Zorn wandt.
14. Wohl dem der in Gottes furchte steht.
15. Mit Fried und Freud ich fahr dahin.
16. Wär Gott nicht mit uns diese Zeit.
17. Jesus Christus unser Heiland
    der den Tod überwand.
18. Komm Gott Schöpfer Heilger Geist.
19. Gott der Vater wohn uns bei.
20. Wir glauben all an einen Gott.
21. Aus tiefer Noth schrei ich zu dir.

The last being an almost entirely new version of the one printed in the "Acht Lieder Buch," the first version does not appear in later hymn books. Seven of these hymns appeared here for the first time, namely, Nos. 1-9-15-16-19-20 and 21. The others had been included in the "Enchiridion." This book is also the original publication of "Dein armer Hauff Herr thut Klagen," by Michael Stieffel, and "Durch Adams Fall ist ganz verderbt," by Lazarus Spengler.

Johann Agricola's hymn, "Fröhlich wollen wir Alleluia singen" had already been published in "Ein weyse Christ lich Mess zu halten und zum Tisch Gottes zu gehen. Martinus Luther. Wittenberg, MDXXIIII."

There has been considerable speculation concerning the question as to which of these two books — the Enchiridion or the "Walther's — was the first to be published. Wackernagel prefers to believe in the priority of the "Enchiridion" because it does not have seven of Luther's hymns, contained in the other. Zahn, however, the later authority, is of contrary opinion and bases his conclusion

on the fact that the "Enchiridion" contains three melodies that are unknown to the "Walther" Book; in the latter also appeared for the first time Luther's well known preface beginning "Das Geystliche Lider singen gut und Gott angenehm sey."

The only copies of the first edition of this book known to be in existence, are, one copy of the Tenor and Bass parts, which is found in the Royal Library at Munich and a copy of the Discant part in the library of the "Drei König's Kirche in Dresden. The seven hymns of Dr. Luther's appearing in the Walther's Book and not in the Enchiridion were published in a supplement to the latter issued in the following year.

Although there was much activity among the compilers, publishers and hymnwriters of Germany during the years immediately following 1524, no Hymnbook of any particular noteworthiness appeared until the "Joseph Klug Gesangbuch" was published in 1529. The work done in the meantime consisted mostly in reprinting and issuing new editions of the Enchiridion, all with more or fewer changes, many single and folio sheets were also published, containing one or two hymns each, some of them new, others those that had already been printed. The presses of Zwickau, Wittenberg, Breslau, Worms, Strassburg, Erfurt and Nuremberg contributed most to the hymn collections of those four years. The year 1525 deserves mention, because Hans Sachs published the first collection of his hymns, and 1526 because Speratus compiled a collection of hymns in Low German. This book having the distinction of being the first printing of Nicolaus Decius' hymn, "Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr," a hymn although having received almost universal favor in the Lutheran Church, yet for some reason not satisfactorily answered, was not included in any collection of Dr. Luther's, a statement also true of his other hymn, "O Lamm Gottes unschuldich."

The "Erfurter Gesangbuch" of 1527 contained sixty-one hymns — ten of them by Hans Sachs.

The "Joseph Klug Gesangbuch" of 1529 bore the title,

"Geistliche Lieder auffs new gebessert zu Wittemberg. D. Mar. Luther. M.D.XXIX., and at the end — gedruckt zu Wittemberg durch Joseph Klug 1529.

This book has first the new preface by Dr. Luther, beginning "Nu haben sich etliche wol beweiset,und die Lieder gemehret, also, das sie mich weit ubertreffen, und jnn dem wol meine Meister sind," then follows the first preface, viz.: "Das geystlich lider singen, etc." followed by 54 hymns, twenty-eight of them Luther's, in the following order:

1st. The Hymns translated by Luther from the original Latin versions.

2d. The Hymns of Luther based on Psalms, among which under the heading: Der XXXXVI Psalm "Deus Noster refugium et virtus," "Ein Feste Burg, etc," which here has only four stanzas. The doxology, "Preis, Ehr und Lob dem, etc.," of many German Hymnbooks was later added by other hands.

3d. The hymns of Justus Jonas, Erhard Hegenwald, Johannes Agricola, Lazarus Spengler, Adam v. Fulda, the two Margraves of Brandenburg — Casimer and Georg — Andreas Knöppen and Elizabeth Creutziger.

4th. German and Latin Litanies and twenty Psalms and canticles.

So far no copy of this book has been discovered or known to be in existence. But that it was published and appeared in the year 1529 seems to be accepted by most bibliographers.

In reference to the matter of the publication of Luther's hymn, "Ein feste Burg," at so early a date as 1529 Wackernagel has the following to say: "It is difficult for us to give up the thought (von dem Gedanken zu lassen) that Luther composed his hymn "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," 1530 at Coburg, during the session of the Diet at Augsburg, and to declare as false the reports of Hieronymus Weller and Johann Sleidan regarding the matter. We must, however, come to this conclusion and hereafter think of the Diet at Speyer in connection with this hymn, and surely, there was more need and occasion for Luther at Wittenberg in 1529,

to lift his eyes to heaven from whence cometh our help, and to pour forth the emotions of his soul in the words of this hymn of assurance, than he was at any time in the following year during the Diet at Augsburg.

Dr. J. Linke, of Altenburg, in a monograph published in Leipzig 1886, under the title "Wann wurde das Lutherlied Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott verfasst?" discusses the various theories that have been advanced and gives it as his opinion that it was written on or about October 31, 1525. In support of this he quotes from Luther's writings of about this date. Julian in his Dictionary of Hymnology dismisses this theory as follows: "That such a hymn could remain in MS. from that date till the publication of Klug's Gesang Buch in 1529, seems very improbable; and no trustworthy evidence is forthcoming that it appeared in print before 1529."

Editions of this, Klug's G. B. with slight changes from the original were printed 1533 and 1535 at Wittenberg and a low German edition at Magdeburg in 1534. The latter, however had quite a different arrangement of the hymns and also had a second part having fifty-eight additional hymns.

Quite a number of other hymn-books appeared during the remaining years of the Reformer's life. Space, however, forbids the mentioning of more than the Book generally known as the "Valentin Babst Gesangbuch," which was printed at Leipzig in 1545 and was the last to receive any revision by Luther's hands.

On the title page underneath the title was printed the following warning:

> "Viel Falscher Meister itzt Lieder tichten
> Sihe dich für und lern sie recht richten
> Wo Gott hin bawet sein Kirch und sein Wort
> Da wil der Teufel sein mit Trug und Mord."

This book had first of all a new preface by Luther beginning: "Der XCVI Psalm spricht, singet dem Herrn ein newes lied, singet dem Herrn alle Welt." In this preface he calls attention to the hymn "Nu lasst uns den Leib begraben," which in several editions had been printed over

his name as if he were the author. He disclaims this and gives credit for the same to Johannes? Weis (should be Michael Weiss, who had translated and published many of the hymns from the Hymn-book of the Bohemian Brethren). He says of the hymn and the author, "Nicht das ichs verwerfe denn es gefellet mir sehr wol, und hat ein guter Poet gemacht, genant Johannes Weis, on das er ein wenig geschwermet hat am Sacrament, Sondern ich wil niemand sein erbeit, mir zu eigen."

The hymnal contained 129 hymns — 37 of them by Luther. The arrangement being as follows: After the index, which occupies seven pages, come the 13 Festival Hymns of Luthers interspersed with prayers and wood cuts. Then the announcement "nu folgen geistliche gesenge, darin der Catechismus kurtz gefasset ist," etc. followed by seven hymns and Psalm CXI, "den man singen mag, wenn man das hochwirdige Sacrament reicht." "Ich dank dem Herrn etc." These hymns and Psalm are also interspersed with prayers and wood cuts. Then the announcement "Folgen nu etliche Psalm zu geistlichen liedern, deutsch gemacht. Durch D. Martinum Luther" followed by 15 hymns based on Psalms. These are again interspersed with prayers, wood cuts and the German and Latin Litanies. After the announcement, "Nu folgen andere der unsere Lieder," followed eleven Hymns of Speratus, Hegenwald, Spengler, Hans Sachs and others. Then the further announcement, "Nu folgen etliche geistliche lieder von frommen Christen gemacht so vor unserer zeit gewesen sind," then the reminder: "Diese alten lieder die hernach folgen haben wir auch mit auf gerafft:" followed by 12 Hymns, one "Der du bist drei in Einigkeit" over Luther's name.

These are followed again by an announcement as follows: "Wir haben auch zu guten exempel, in das Buehlein gesetzet die heiligen lieder, aus der heiligen schrift" followed by twenty-six canticles and Psalms. Then the hymn, "Nu lasst uns den Leib begraben," under Luther's name, which circumstance probably caused him to enter the disclaimer in the preface to the book as above noted.

The announcement "Nu folgen christlich geseng lateinish und deutsch zum begrebniss," Dr. Martinus Luther is followed by seven Latin Scripture texts — one Latin hymn and six German hymns already published in a separate volume in 1542 closing the first part of the volume with Luther's preface to the last mentioned hymnal.

The second part opens with a title page, as follows: "Psalmen und Geistliche lieder, welche von fromen Christen gemacht und zusammen gelesen sind. Leipzig."

It contains forty hymns in two parts. The first having nine hymns written by various authors, and the second thirty-one; over the second part appears the announcement, "Nu folgen andere geistliche lieder von fromen Christen gemacht," among which we find fourteen from the hymnbook of the Bohemian Brethren translated into German by Michael Weiss, a collection of hymns which in after years exerted quite an influence on German hymnody.

An index of the hymns of the second part closes the collection, and on the last page we find repeated the imprint which appeared on the last page of its first part, viz:

> "Gedruckt zu Leipzig durch Valentin Babst in der Ritterstrassen M. DXLV."

All the hymns of the entire collection have melodies printed above them excepting only the following four: "Vom Himmel hoch da komm ich her," "Was fürchst du feind Herodes sehr," "Der Herr ist mein treuer Hirt," and "Wir waren im grossen leid." Two of the hymns have each two melodies, "Wo Gott der Herr nicht bey uns hält," and "Nun freut euch lieben christen gemein." Only three copies of the original edition of this hymnbook are known to be still in existence, one in the public library at Weimar, another in that of Goettingen, and the third in a private library at Berlin.

This book was frequently reprinted, and remained in general use for a long time. At the divine services in the churches only the better known hymns were sung, and this usually without the aid of hymnbooks. Not until the mid-

dle of the seventeenth century did it become a general custom to take the hymnbook along to church. Books were not very plentiful in the early years of the Reformation. The slow methods of hand-printing made them expensive, and few of the households of those days could boast of more than one hymnbook. In the homes it was used mostly as a book of devotion, and great efforts were made to learn "auswendig" as many of the hymns as possible. Often the new hymns were printed on single sheets, frequently, two or three on one sheet. These were widely distributed by being carried from town to town and sold at the public markets or annual fairs. Sometimes they were sung to the gathered crowds by those offering them for sale. Johannes Vulpius relates an instance of this kind, that happened in the city of Magdeburg on May 6th, 1524. He tells us that a poor old man, a clothmaker by trade, was found singing "Aus tiefer Noth schrei ich zu dir" and "Es wollt uns Gott genädich sein" to a large concourse of people gathered about him on the public square, and offering the hymns, printed on single sheets, for sale. The magistrate or "Bügermeister," who had just come from early mass, had the man arrested and cast into prison. Whereupon a committee of two hundred citizens waited upon the magistrate and were successful in securing the man's release.

By such and similar means the hymns became quickly popular, and many learned not only the hymns, but also the melodies written for them, and once learned they were not easily forgotten.

They were sung by the children at the schools, by the mother to her babe in the cradle, by the laborer in the field and the artisan at his bench, by the maid in the kitchen, and the daughters of the household at their spinning wheel. Every where and in all places the inspiring words of comfort or assurance of these Evangelical hymns, might be heard sung to the rythmic strains of the grand old Chorals.

A story is related of how after the capitulation of Magdeburg to Charles the Fifth, Melanchthon, Jonas and Creutziger, being banished from the city, found refuge in Wei-

mar, and there in a little room discussing their sad plight and future plans, they heard a little girl, on the street underneath the window of their room, singing "Ein feste Burg." Their drooping spirits were at once revived and Melanchthon is quoted as saying: "Sing, dear daughter, thou knowest not what great personages thou art now comforting."

Surely there is not much cause for wonder, that the people "fairly sang themselves into the doctrines of the reformation," as has so often been affirmed by historians of that eventful period. So that even the enemies of Evangelical truth declared that Luther had "destroyed more souls by his hymns, than by his other writings and his sermons."

A bibliographical survey, like the foregoing, of the hymnbooks published during Luther's lifetime and the Reformer's contributions to them, can only serve to show us his many-sidedness in a clearer light, to give us a deeper appreciation of his services in the cause of truth against error and to justify the verdict of the centuries that has honored him with the title "Father of German Hymnody." It would certainly be impossible to overrate the value of what he did in this respect, and all for the purpose, that the people might be able to fully join in the true worship of the Triune God.

To this end he not only wrote the hymns and sang them to the notes of the melodies for them which he produced on his Lute, but he showed by precept and example what ought to be done and encouraged and urged others to follow. Of his attempt to provide a form of worship, he writes in 1524 to his friend Spalatin: "It is my desire, after the examples of the Prophets and the ancient fathers, to make German Psalms for the people, that is spiritual songs, so that the Word of God may be kept alive among them by singing. We are, therefore seeking every where for Poets, and since you are a master of the German language and are so mighty and eloquent therein, I entreat you to aid us in this work and to make a hymn from one of the Psalms, after the sample of the one I send you herewith. I would desire, however, that you do not use the new words of the

Court, so that the lauguage may be within the understanding of the common people, very plain and ordinary, but so pure and true and so easily understood, that the sense of the Psalm may be properly given."

He thus saw the need of solid and substantial work along the lines indicated in his letter, and his efforts to have it done were devoted and untiring. To this end he brought into constant use his fervent zeal and his masterful power over a vigorous and simple German. He gathered about him his co-laborers and in the circle of his friends and his family everything new was tried and corrected and sung until all was satisfactory. He was therefore the master builder, who initiated, and directed and encouraged until he had laid the foundation deep and sure and strong, upon which in after years was builded a temple of Christian hymnody, that has not been equalled by any other land or people and from whose rich treasure all have drawn inspiration.

The value and success of the Reformer's efforts to provide for the German people a hymnody in their own language cannot therefore be questioned, and while we are fully justified in maintaining that to him belongs the honor of having laid the foundation of congregational singing, yet it would be a mistake to assume that there was no such thing as a German hymn before Luther's time. Many eminent scholars have busied themselves with a study of this subject and have brought to light many interesting facts concerning the pre-reformation history of German hymns.

One of the most noted works on the subject being the "Geschichte des Deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luther's Zeit," by Hoffman v. Fallersleben.

These inquiries have proven the existence of German religious hymns before the days of the Reformation. They were not, however, hymns in the same sense in which we are accustomed to value those of Luther and his co-workers and those who followed them, nor were they sung in the public services in God's house.

The Teutonic people from the earliest ages were a

music-loving and singing people. They had their bards and their poets who had written for them their "Volkslieder" and their "religious hymns," and had sung to them their lyric rhymes and recited their elegiac verses in the language of the people. But from the introduction of Christianity into Germany, Latin had been the language of the Church, a circumstance which had largely militated against the development of German speech and literature. The whole church service was regulated by the Romish liturgy in its ancient form. The use of a German hymn was therefore not to be thought of nor countenanced by the clergy. There appeared, however, the necessity to worship God in the mother tongue; the people were not satisfied with the sole use of a strange language in giving voice to the holiest and highest emotions of their hearts. But the only times when they were at liberty to thus exercise the privilege of doing so in the common language was at the many great Christian "Volksfests," the "Feierlichkeiten," public processions, on high festival days and saints days and similar occasions. At these the Romish liturgy did not seem sufficient, and the use of German was not forbidden by any orders from Rome.

They, the German hymns of this period, were therefore limited to such as were actually sung at such occasions. It is true, of course, that at the services in the churches there was responsive singing between the priest and the choir and at certain places in the service the entire congregation joined in the singing of the "Kyrie Eleison" or "Christe Eleison." But there was no such thing as a hymn sung by the congregation. The people were simply shut out from all participation in the Church services. "Silent presence" was the only demand upon them, according to the law as laid down to them by "Abt Pirminius" to "pray silently and sing only with their hearts."

While we therefore can discover in the "Volks song" of the early Germans the germ which under the cultivation of the Reformers and their followers, grew into the splendid

proportions of German hymnody, of which our Lutheran Church has just reason to be proud, there can no more than this be claimed for it nor does it in the least detract from the credit of those who made good use of it. And it is more than probable that, because Luther was imbued with the poetry of the common people, because he possessed in a great measure the poetic element and the lyrical and musical fibre of the German and made intelligent use of them, that he, in the providence of Almighty God, so quickly touched an answering chord in the hearts of his countrymen; thereby opening the way for the reception of Evangelical truth and winning these people for the cause of the Reformation, thus creating about himself and his co-workers in a comparatively short space of time a bulwark of the strength of the nation, against which the opposition of his enemies could avail nothing.

THE OVERTURES FROM THE LIMA LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION TO THE JOINT SYNOD.

PRESIDENT L. H. SCHUH, Ph. D., COLUMBUS. O.

Ever since its organization the Lima College has been knocking at the doors of Joint Synod and asking for shelter, sympathy and a home. Its various efforts to get under the wing of Synod have been futile, until at last it ceased to ask.

At the Michigan City convention of Joint Synod in 1902, there was no proposition from that school to Synod. But the prospects of the school never looked more hopeful. Its then President, Rev. S. P. Long, A. M., was meeting with much success in the management of its debt. He reported the greater part of the money subscribed and the end of the financial difficulties of the institution seemed to be in sight. It seemed that by the next session of Joint Synod all its debts would be wiped out. Many thought that there ought to be a closer relation between that school and the Synod, and it was resolved on the floor of Synod that over-

tures with a view to such closer relations be entertained from that school. In order to expedite matters these overtures were to be placed before the District Synods which were to discuss them and report to Joint Synod.

The Lima Lutheran Educational Association met and sent out the following as the result of its deliberations: ,

OVERTURES FROM THE LIMA LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION TO THE JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO AND OTHER STATES.

WHEREAS, The Lima College movement originated within the bounds of the Joint Synod of Ohio and other states and was intended to serve first of all the interests of her people, and

WHEREAS, At the last meeting of that body a resolution was passed "that the Joint Synod is ready to receive overtures with reference to a closer relation to Lima College and that such overtures be placed before our Districts for discussion before the next convention of that body," and

WHEREAS, Such relation, we believe will serve the best interests of Synod as well as Lima College; therefore be it

Resolved, First, that we, the Lima Lutheran Educational Association, offer to transfer the property held by us, consisting of ten acres of ground with College building and equipment as well as all subscriptions and rights in legacies which have been made to us for the purposes of Lima College, to the above named synod to be used according to the intent for which the money invested was given and legacies were made, namely the co-education of the two sexes.

Resolved, Secondly, that if at any time for good reasons the property should be sold the proceeds of such sale shall always be used according to the original intent.

Resolved, Thirdly, that in such transfer synod assume the remaining indebtedness resting upon the institution.

Unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Lima Luth. Educational Association held at Lima, Ohio, June 16th, 1903.

These overtures have been discussed by various Districts, and while several of them have voted favorably, with the probable exception of the First English District, the majority vote was not large nor enthusiastic. This we believe to be due in the main to happenings at Lima. Pres. Long resigned his work. It was not finished. A goodly amount of money subscribed was not collected, and no pro-

vision was made for current expenses which were accumulating while the original debt was being raised. The debt has grown. It looks formidable to some, and in view of the state of our General Treasury, which is running behind in spite of the tidal wave of prosperity that has swept over the land there is a hesitancy to increase our financial obligations. If the Synod assumes this school that body not only makes itself responsible for this debt amounting we are informed to about $13,000, but it assumes the support of the institution. This debt we believe to be the storm center. Had Pres. Long remained at the helm and continued his work until the next Joint Synod, the reports would have been so favorable that all other issues, such as co-education and the expediency of the Church entering the field of higher secular education, would have been silenced by the acceptance of the school. Now the debt cannot be handled until the next meeting of Synod. And by the side of this school there stands this grim specter and the one cannot be accepted without the other. ,,

Several solutions are possible. The Synod can entirely reject these overtures which were called forth by its own action. That will mean that the Lima College must be run as a private institution or that whatever its friends do with it, will be acceptable to our Synod. There is no reason why it should not succeed as a private institution. It has many and enthusiastic friends. Its debt can be carried along and sufficient money can be raised to pay interest and current expenses. By degrees the attendance could be raised and the debt reduced by gifts and legacies.

Another solution is to allow the Synod to have a semi-official connection with the school as, for example, to appoint members to its board without being responsible for its debts. The Educational Association will, however, scarcely be willing to enter such an arrangement. It would still have to continue to bear its own burdens. If that is the case, why should it be hampered by any connection with Synod? This body would occasionally exercise a restraining influence upon the Association without making any direct compensation for

it. If the Synod enters any closer relations with Lima College it should control it entirely. If this is not satisfactory to the majority it should leave its hands off entirely. Synod should either make itself responsible financially for the school, or leave the Association free to manage its own affairs. We want no partnership arrangement.

A third solution is for Joint Synod to accept the school. Should this come to pass we hope that it will be with the distinct understanding that the institution is to be consolidated with one of our present schools; or that all our work be so arranged that various departments of our schools be merged into one. We have made the mistake of starting too many schools and giving them all a very meagre equipment. We do not now want to add another one and then, for lack of funds, permit it to eke out an existence. We do not want more, but fewer schools. If the institutions that we already have are to do work that compares with other institutions, we must turn our attention to them in a different way in the future than in the past. Educational work has gone along with mighty strides. Wealthy Americans and the State have been lavish with their money for educational purposes. Within the last twenty years the American university has developed. Everything that money can buy is secured to advance the work. Laboratories, libraries, gymnasia and innumerable accessories to school work are at hand. While we do not dream of keeping up with such stately institutions, we cannot ignore the fact that they are setting the pace in the educational world. They create an atmosphere and the smaller colleges must in a measure, at least, offer some of these advantages or go under. What family lives as our pioneers did fifty years ago? Comforts and luxuries are brought within reach to-day that were unheard of then. What school tries to get along with such an equipment as it had fifty years ago? Certainly none.

The schools which our Synod now has are hampered by their very modest equipment. To take our own as an example. We need a reference library which could be secured at an expense of $2,000, i. e., we could make a fair

beginning with that sum. We need $2,000 more for our laboratories and could easily use $5,000. We need an auditorium for $10,000, and could easily invest $15,000. We need a good piano for $400. There ought to be at a school like ours a good relief map of the Holy Land. This costs $70. Our department libraries in the recitation rooms should be enlarged. This would take $2,000. Another $2,000 would scarcely build the required sidewalks and make the necessary repairs on our buildings and property. If in the next two years we were to have an extra allowance of $50,000 we would still be a very modest school compared to a dozen colleges in the state of Ohio alone. As it is, we are trying to eke out an existence on an allowance of $13,500, of which sum $12,000 are required for salaries alone. The remaining sum of $1,500 cannot pay a fuel bill of $950, an insurance bill of $300, a house bill of $250 and a great number of smaller bills, aggregating about $500. This leaves a deficit with which to make improvements and keep up repairs.

Our people in general and our pastors in particular, are looking to us to put up a school that will turn out men who compare favorably with other schools. We cannot do this on wind. It takes money and a great deal more money than has been put at our disposal in the past.

We cannot speak for Woodville and St. Paul, but doubt not that their equipment needs improving as much as ours does. In the face of all this can our Synod accept the Lima College and equip that too? It ought to get clear to us that one school well prepared to do work would attract more students and do our church more honor than three sickly schools huddled together in one state. It would have been much better if years ago all these schools had not been started. The work now done at these three schools could all have been done at Capital University much to the advantage of our Synod. But they are here now and our only salvation is to combine them in such a way that they will meet the various needs of the church.

We propose the following plan for the consideration of the delegates at our next Joint Synod meeting:

Let Lima College be accepted by Synod and united with the Woodville school. This would imply the selling of the property at Lima and the opening of Woodville to co-education. With the money realized from the sale of the property at Lima a new building could be erected at Woodville, or if Woodville is not the proper place let that property be disposed of also and the new school located at some place that would offer a suitable site and buildings *free*. We believe that such a place could be found, for example, at Fremont, or at Dayton, Ohio, at which latter place there is now a $50,000 proposition awaiting a good school.

There is nothing to prevent the sale of the property at Lima; in fact, the overtures state that such may be done. The only condition that is attached to these overtures is that the money realized from such sale be used for co-education. One of our largest Districts, the Northern, has already voted to open Woodville to women. Consistency, it seems, would demand it. Our congregations accept the services of women in their parochial schools, but our Synod denies these women the privilege of preparing for the work. These two schools have up to this time had one great object in common, viz., the preparation of teachers. In addition to the Normal there should be a Classical, Scientific, Business and Commercial, Literary, Music course and such other work as the means and teaching force would allow. This school would need little if any larger appropriation than Woodville is now getting.

To this school could be transferred the Preparatory Department of the Capital University. All the branches which we have in this department would be there. This transfer would mean much for our school at Columbus. It would enable us to make a full fledged seminary which we have not yet had. We have nine classes at Columbus and nine men. The transfer of two classes would mean that two additional men could give their entire force to the seminary, which is the equivalent of all the time devoted by our

four professors of theology to that department now. This would enable us to have a complete division of all the classes and to arrange all the work in a normal way. It would be a great step forward and would mean much for the coming generation of pastors. We have for long been lagging behind other Lutheran bodies in our seminary work. This would give us a college and seminary at Columbus of which we could justly be proud.

It might take a few years to carry out this plan, but it would offer a solution for the whole educational work now done by our Synod.

In conclusion we say if the Synod accepts Lima College let it be with the idea of bringing about a consolidation of our schools; if this cannot be done, or if it is not acceptable to the friends of Lima let that school be run by its friends as a private institution.

NOTES AND ITEMS.

I. ORTHODOX VS. LIBERAL THEOLOGY IN NORWAY.

The church of Norway is for the first time in the present generation enjoying the doubtful delights of a vigorous contest between advanced and conservative theology. Bishop Heuch, a leading representative of the orthodox Lutheran state church, has in rapid succession published two books "Mod Strömmen," and "Svar," (i. e. "Against the Stream," and "An Answer") in which he has made a vigorous attack on the newer theology that is forcing its way chiefly from Germany into the Norwegian church. The attack is directed primarily against the famous address of Pastor Klavenes, delivered some months ago at the International Church Conference in Lund, in which the speaker claimed that the church and Christianity can retain their hold on the educated classes only by making a compromise with modern thought, and this will include modifications of the traditional views on the juridic atonement theory, on mechanical Inspiration of the Scriptures, etc., and by a return

to the simple gospel as originally proclaimed by Christ. In these demands Bishop Heuch sees the full evidences of a revived rationalism and appeals to pulpit and pew to antagonize these innovations. Rather singularly he himself has not been able altogether to resist the influence of modern theological thought. He thinks it a fact that both the Anselm and the later Satisfaction theory cannot fully stand the Biblical test, and that in the matter of Old Testament criticism the newer views are to a certain extent to be accepted. He too is of the opinion that the Imprecatory Psalms cannot have been inspired, but takes the position that the teachings of Christ, direct and indirect, are to be accepted as a finality in questions pertaining also to the literary investigations of the Old Testament. He accordingly considers it unbelief to doubt the Davidic origin of the 110th Psalm. These polemical works of the Bishop have caused a great excitement in the Norwegian and indeed in the whole Scandinavian church, although the pastors and professors are somewhat slow in taking a decided stand either pro or con. All the more are the public journals, both the ecclesiastical and the secular, discussing the matter, and it has become the burning question of the day. In the pietistically inclined congregations, which are in the majority in Norway, the feeling is evidently with the Bishop, but it is quite clear that particularly the younger pastors look with considerable favor upon the new theological ideas and ideals. In reality this Heuch controversy is only the second act of a drama, the first of which began when it appeared that Harnack's book on the Essence of Christianity proved unexpectedly popular on the Scandinavian peninsula; but down to the present time the controversy had been carried on more quietly, in synods, conferences and the like, but the growth of the advanced theology has forced the defenders of the older ways to make it a public matter. In the fifties the independent and liberal movement in theology, as headed by Grundtvig was rather summarily crushed particularly by the determined opposition of the theological professors of the Universities, and since that time ortho-

doxy has had practically supreme sway in Norway; but it is more than doubtful if this programme could be carried on now. A new generation of teachers is in the Universities and some of these have not been uninfluenced by the newer criticisms of the Scriptures and the dogmatical theory of a Rischl. Even such a noble protagonist of orthodox views as the late Professor Petersen, sought an understanding with modern thought. The controversy must no doubt be fought to the finish on its own merits in Norway as in other sections of the Protestant Church.

II. INTER-CATHOLIC CONTENTIONS.

Recent events have again demonstrated the fact that the spirit of independent scholarship within the Catholic church of Germany is one of the factors with which the church authorities must reckon. Although the movement has lost in the death of Professor Franz X. Kraus, of the University of Freiburg, its ablest exponent since the days of Döllinger, and although the old Catholic faculty in Bonn, through the indifference of the Prussian government, has been allowed to become practically extinct, other representatives of this tendency have appeared in various sections of the church. None indeed have the learning and the skill of Kraus, whose "Spectator" Letters in the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung,* in which he subjected modern religious movements, including those within the Catholic church, and in particular Jesuitism, to a searching historical criticism, filled the Ultramontane party with as intense a horror as did Döllinger's letters in the same journal in 1870 during the sessions of the Vatican Council. The *Kirchenzeitung* of Leipzig significantly remarked that at the death of Kraus the Ultramontane party had sent up to heaven a silent Te Deum, and it is an open secret that this fine scholarship failed to get a Bishop's office because of his independence. Within recent months Professor Schell, of Würzburg, who several years ago created a sensation by declaring that the

principles of Roman Catholicism are consistent with genuine modern progressive thought and life, but afterwards humbly declared his *"peccavi,"* has again given offense by daring to publish in the *Thuemer,* a leading independent and brilliant monthly, what his Catholic critics declare to be "a characterization of Protestantism that practically amounts to a panegyric," and declines to see in the great rival of the Catholic church only a *"pestifera secta,"* as official Jesuit public opinion demands. Still greater offense has been given by a remarkable book published by the Catholic theological professor in Strassburg, Dr. Albert Ehrhard, entitled *"Der Katholicismus und das Zwanzigste Jahrhundert,"* of whichthe first edition was exhausted in ten days, and six editions have appeared within the last three months. In this virtually the same position is taken that Schell defended, but this is done so skillfully that even the "Germania," of Berlin and other leading Catholic journals at first approved of the book. A closer examination shows that the author makes noteworthy concessions to modern thought, and that he is particularly independent over against the claims of the Papacy, particularly in reference to the temporal power. The position taken by this trio of leading Roman Catholic scholars finds expression also in several leading journals of that church, particularly the *Historisch-Politische Blaetter,* the *Quartalschrift,* of Tübingen, and the *Jahrbuch of the Goerres Society,* the best scientific periodicals of Catholic scholars on the continent. Quite naturally this independent spirit is sharply attacked by men of the church. Especially is the Jesuit theological faculty in Inssbruck active in this direction, which is the learned representative of Ultramontanism in Central Europe, as the so-called "Free University" of Freiburg in Switzerland has no recognition or standing as a seat of scholarship. Their organ is the *Zeitschrift fuer Katholische Theologie,* which defends throughout the philosophy, natural as well as intellectual, of the Jesuits. The most virulent popular opposition to even the slightest sign of independent thought within the Catholic church, is the French paper published

in Alsace, called *"Journal de Colmar."* which is more Ultramontane than the Pope himself. It is largely on account of this journal that no Catholic faculty had been established in connection with the University of Strassburg until recently, as it is an axiom among the Jesuit party that this independence comes from contact with the scientific researches of Protestant scholars and that no Catholic priest should receive his education at a large university but only in an Episcopal Seminary. A large section of the church accordingly demands the abolition of these Catholic university faculties entirely, which movement has however found a most determined opponent in Count von Hertling, the best known non-theological Catholic scholar in Germany, who in this is warmly seconded by a large portion of the Catholic press.

III. EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE.

The German *Orientgesellschaft,* which is under the especial patronage of the Kaiser, has undertaken the work of excavating in Palestine, in addition to the work it is doing in Babylon and Egypt. It is co-operating with the German Society for the exploration of Palestine, and under the direction of Dr. G. Schumacher excavations have been made for the last season at Tel el Mutesellim, long thought to cover some important city of ancient times, probably the ancient city of Megiddo, a city famous in Palestine even before the entrance of the Jews under Joshua, and the site of the famous battle between the Egyptian army of Thothmes III and the confederate Kings of Palestine. Professor Sellin, of Vienna, had already pitched upon this tel for some private excavating work,and it was soon amicably agreed that he should take the Tel Ta'annek (the Taanach of Josh. 12, 21) lying to the eastward, while the German Society should work to the south of the main tel. Operations under Dr. Schumacher began on April 1st, 1903, and work was continued for two months. The highest part of the tel was first attacked as probably concealing some acrop-

polis, and here was actually discovered a tower whose steps led to massive stone walls, eight feet thick, of an ancient acropolis. While all of the gateway has not been laid bare, it is plain that the work is Jewish. Remains of brick work and a water conduit are found here. Some 12 inches or so under the surface were found remains of a quadrangular building, about 20 feet square, in which are two erect stone pillars, so-called *Matseboth.* They were about 12 feet apart and about 7 feet tall. To the right of one of the *Matseboth* was a third column, only 4 feet high. In a chamber near that containing the *Matseboth* were found three sacrificial urns, which were filled with sifted earth and the skeletons of some very young children. The head of the child was invariably at the bottom of the jar. It is suggested that these were sacrificed when the building was erected. An idol some 18 inches high was found here; it is evidently of Egyptian origin. Other Egyptian articles, such as porcelain eyes and amulets, were found here. Deeper excavations uncovered more of the walls, a building of unbaked bricks, several idols, and on two upright stone columns the Phoenician letters *Samek* and *Zayin.* In a part of the ruins were found several clay seals with the inscription LEG VI PR, showing that the Sixth Roman Legion must have been encamped here for some time. Remains of a Roman theater have also been found in the neighborhood, showing the permanence of the Roman occupation here. It is hoped that the next campaign, opened during the autumn, will furnish still more important finds, as the ruins of Megiddo must contain much of value to archæologists when the excavators have gone deep enough into the tel.

IV. BABYLONISM.

The classical "Ex Oriente Lux" has again become the object of a vigorous controversy in modern Bliblical research. The tendency in Old Testament criticism to trace the religious teachings of the Jewish Scriptures to Baby-

lonian sources has been marked and in Delitzsch's "Babel und Bibel" has probably reached its most pointed expression, as he finds in the cuneiform inscriptions not only the sources of the Old Testament narratives of the creation, of the fall, of the deluge, of the story of paradise and of angels and demons, but even of the name of Jahwe. It is a singular phenomenon that this "Babylonism" has found its way even into classical philology and history. Only recently in the "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie," Professor Jensen of the University of Marburg, published a series of 26 theses in which the attempt was made to trace the ancient Epic poetry of Greece, especially the Odyssey to the oldest poem of the Euphrates valley, the famous Gilgamis Epic of Babylonia. Jensen has analyzed the Odyssey into two portions, both of which describe a journey to the Lower World, and finds in the characters of the Greek poem and their actions, parallels in great abundance to the contents of the Gilgamis story. A protest against this has promptly appeared from Jensen's colleague in Marburg, Professor Ernst Maas, who holds the Greek chair, and has published a sharp criticism in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, No. 16, under the title "Das Gilgamis-Epos und Homer." He does not deny that there may be certain external points of agreement between the Greek and the Babylonian Epics, but declares that it requires a faith that will remove mountains and carry them both to the sea that can dream of making the one dependent upon the other. He emphatically declares that classical philology cannot sanction such arbitrary combinations and that such methods are unscientific and absurd. In fact the belief that ancient culture took an eastward and not a westward course originally seems to be gaining ground. Hommel's views as to the relation of early Egyptians to Babylonian civilization are well known. The English investigator Arthur J. Evans, in his recent work on "The Mycenean Tree and Pillar Cult and Its Mediterranean Relations," describes some wonderful discoveries he has made in Crete, on the basis of which he maintains that already in pre-Phœnician and pre-Hellenic times there was

a migration of religious cultus from the West to the East, finding imitations of the tree and pillar cultus of the earliest Mycenean period in later times in Philistaea and Palestine, e. eg., in Gen. 28, 18 sqq. Evans is of the opinion that these finds will seriously limit the territory in which Semitic culture has an original development.

V. THE "MESSIANISM" OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT CHURCH.

Roman Catholics and Protestants, especially on the Continent, are vieing with each other in the establishment of Christian social movements that will win the masses by an application of the law of love. In Germany, Court Preacher Stöcker and Pastor von Bodelschwingh have in their "Inner Mission Work" developed a phenomenal activity in this direction; while Archbishop von Ketteler and other Catholic dignitaries have at least equalled these efforts. The latest promising agitation of this character has been developed in Protestant France and is termed by its leader, Pasteur, Wilfred Monod, of Rouen, "Messianism," although the press more frequently terms it "The Solidarity Movement." In the *Alte Glaube,* No. 2, of Leipzig, Pastor E. Roerich, gives some interesting details of this propaganda. From this source we translate the following:

Christian Social Movements are not absolutely new in France. Who can forget the immortal *"Paroles d'un Croyant"* of Lamannais that with the voice of thunder shook the Catholic church of France some decades ago. And again still later, the former cavalry officer, Count de Mun, both in the Parliament and in Catholic assemblies, appealed to the wealthy for a Christian treatment of the proletariat. Still later the free Protestant pastor Fallot, of Paris, with burning eloquence asked for a practical demonstration of Christian faith. The new leader, Monod, while not a marked man or an eloquent speaker, has nevertheless managed to inaugurate a movement that is rapidly extend-

ing over the whole country and has especially been successful in the northern departments.

The peculiarity of the movement is not that it calls for love for the poor and the poorest in the land, but the outspoken determination to effect an improvement and betterment in the doctrinal status of the church in reference to all matters of Christian activity, and in the end to reform the whole modern conception of things, by Christianizing the whole thought and activity of human society, especially by uniting positive Christians in coöperating for the social, economic and spiritual condition of the lower masses! The "New-Christians," as they also term themselves, recognize in Christ the only way to the Father, but see in Christ more than a Savior from sin. The salvation of the individual sinner is not the highest purpose of the gospel. Christ is first and foremost the founder of the Kingdom of God, and that too not a Kingdom that is locked up in heaven to be opened only on the last day, but of a Kingdom that already exists upon earth, in which Christian faith brings forth the most glorirus fruits of love for the benefit chiefly of those who stand in greatest need of such charity, the most lowly in the land. No man, who is compelled to put all his efforts and time to secure the bare necessities of life, is in a condition to think of higher and nobler things, and to enable him to do this is one of the purposes of the "Solidarites." The ideals of Christ can only be realized when the poor and the rich, the learned and the unlearned, the high and the low, constitute one Christian social organization in which Christian love demonstrates its power by actual works, and all become one body for the realization of the ideals of the Nazarene.

Monod writes: He who knows and loves the Lord sees in him more than the founder of a new religion; he is the life that has become flesh. He sees in Christ his full temporal anad earthly salvation as well as his eternal life. The fact that Christ is not recognized and his principles applied in our Parliaments, in the University, in the Bourse, is just as tenable as if he were not a power in the Church. The

Reform of reforms must consist in making Christ a living reality everywhere; and this must be done by solidarity of his followers. Individual personal Christianity is necessary, but its purpose is only to be a means to an evangelization of the masses through practical sanctification. Therefore we contend against everything that is individual in Christianity. It is a false creed that teaches the Christian that his home is in heaven and that he is a stranger here upon earth. This is a pessimistic and dark Christianity. The Protestant church will never realize the Kingdom of God upon earth as long as it teaches an individual salvation. Hitherto Christians were in philosophical matters pessimists, and in social matters optimists. This must now be inverted, and this indicates the marked difference between current Christianity and Messianism.

Another leading writer of this school, Pastor Gounelle, says: O, if only our orthodox brethren would recognize the fact that positive Christianity can be saved only by a radical change in its conception and especially the application of its principles to the needs of the hour; only by making Christianity a socialistic propaganda.

The leaders of the movement do not purpose to antagonize the church, but rather to lead it into new paths and to make its principles practical guides for the treatment of the masses. They work against drunkenness, the social evil, gambling, immoral literature. They are a unit in condemning war and the colonial policy of modern states. Not a few condemn military service altogether, and those who refuse to serve in the army are applauded as heroes. Practically they apply the teachings of their schools by the establishment of "solidarites," or "homes" throughout France, in which the poor receive all proper attention and their tenets are advocated by addresses and sermons. The whole movement is as a rule regarded with considerable favor by the people and the press.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. JUNE, 1904. No. 3.

THE PREDESTINATION CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

No great disappointment was experienced by the lack of any definite results attained by the Conference at Detroit. By those acquainted with the situation it was not expected that an agreement of the contending parties would be reached. The chasm is too wide to be bridged over in a few days. The most hopeful feature of the discussions and deliberations was the resolution not to abandon the work, but to meet again next year for its continuance, although the postponement for so long a time indicates some abatement of zeal and ardour and hope.

We think it wise that the Conference did not give way to the discouragements which presented themselves, but resolved rather to seek peace and ensue it, while it contended earnestly for the faith. There are grave difficulties in the way of agreement, but in our estimation they are not absolutely insuperable. It is well to work on in the patience of hope, though it be often with heavy heart, until the victory is won or the rupture is plainly irremediable, and one party is thus driven to regard the other, painful as it would be, as a sect among other sects with whom there can be no fellowship. Notwithstanding the chasm between us and the cessation of fraternal relations, there is still a feeling, even if it be but a fond memory of the past, that we belong together and should not yet declare the separation final, as it is between Lutheran and Reformed churches. Let all

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. JUNE, 1904. No. 3.

THE PREDESTINATION CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

No great disappointment was experienced by the lack of any definite results attained by the Conference at Detroit. By those acquainted with the situation it was not expected that an agreement of the contending parties would be reached. The chasm is too wide to be bridged over in a few days. The most hopeful feature of the discussions and deliberations was the resolution not to abandon the work, but to meet again next year for its continuance, although the postponement for so long a time indicates some abatement of zeal and ardour and hope.

We think it wise that the Conference did not give way to the discouragements which presented themselves, but resolved rather to seek peace and ensue it, while it contended earnestly for the faith. There are grave difficulties in the way of agreement, but in our estimation they are not absolutely insuperable. It is well to work on in the patience of hope, though it be often with heavy heart, until the victory is won or the rupture is plainly irremediable, and one party is thus driven to regard the other, painful as it would be, as a sect among other sects with whom there can be no fellowship. Notwithstanding the chasm between us and the cessation of fraternal relations, there is still a feeling, even if it be but a fond memory of the past, that we belong together and should not yet declare the separation final, as it is between Lutheran and Reformed churches. Let all

at least be fully sure of their ground before such an eventful step is taken.

Perhaps we were too sanguine in our expectation of beneficent results from our united labors in the Synodical Conference, though we see no reason to regret the honest effort; perhaps we are too sanguine now in our expectation of beneficent results from our free conferences, but we can see no reason why the effort should not be earnestly made so long as in faith and charity there is any ground for hope.

It is needless to say that we seek no compromise. On Christian ground this is impossible. Those who insist that one or the other party in the controversy must yield before there can be unity are unquestionably right. Compromises can only inure to the benefit of error: truth must always lose to the extent of concessions made, and the result is only to render error more deceptive and more successful. We make no plea for peace at the expense of revealed truth. It is one of the encouraging aspects of the deplorable controversy that all are of one mind in that regard. Both parties claim to prize the heavenly truth above all earthly treasures. In an evil time, when sin and Satan are making their most furious assaults on the revelation given by inspiration of God in the Holy Scriptures, and are doing this in the captivating name of science, which it is so difficult for human nature to resist, the lovers of truth feel forcibly drawn together in their warfare against a mighty foe and in their companionship in the tribulation to which such warfare subjects them. There are few in these days, when the carnal mind has gained such mastery in the field of science, and the defense of everlasting truth as against the dominant "science falsely so-called" subjects to ignominy in the world of learning, who are willing to endure the blame and the shame of resisting the materialistic claims of evolutionary philosophy in its physical and historical rebellion against the Lord of hosts as He speaks to us in His Word, which alone gives light in the darkness that sin has brought into the world; and these few are largely in the ranks of those who are now arrayed against each other.

To this we must add the pleasant memories of former fraternal fellowship and united contention for the faith once delivered to the saints and confessed by the Ev. Lutheran Church, and therefore of harmonious refusal to enter into any unions or compacts that made concessions to error or abated one jot or tittle of the divine truth which the Scriptures reveal and which the grace of God enabled our fathers to confess at Augsburg. We cannot forget how we labored together and suffered together, and believing that the truth would ultimately prevail, hoped together that the whole professedly Lutheran Church in this land would yet assert itself as the true visible Church of God on earth, in doctrine and in practice bearing testimony to the saving truth.

We need not be told that this is all sentiment, which proves nothing as to our duty in the sorrow that has befallen us. We are not ignorant of that, as we are not ignorant of the changed conditions. But there are a few in the Synodical Conference as well as in our own Synod who remember these things, and who with us, now that in God's good providence the efforts at peace have been renewed, are not willing to abandon the hope of coming to an agreement as long as the opposing parties are yet willing to meet in conference. Meantime let us not be misunderstood. Our feeling must not be permitted to get the better of our faith. If we must bear the sorrow of division down to the grave, that is better than to make compromises which may deprive thousands, or even millions, of the hope of glory beyond the grave.

The glimmering hope which we yet entertain that our conferences with Missouri will not be altogether without avail, rests on the conviction that some will see the light which the truth sheds and will be bound by it in their consciences, so that they will abandon their error and accept the old doctrine of the Lutheran Church. Probably it would have been better to say, that they will abide by the old truth, which they had learned before the predestinarian innovation was unfortunately made, and to which they had

never given their consent, though they continued to be members of the Synod which caused the rupture by the introduction of Calvinistic elements. Our opinion has remained unchanged through all the years since the controversy began, that a large portion of those who belonged to the Synodical Conference never intelligently accepted the predestinarian teaching of their leaders, and continued in their connection by reason of the circumstances which originally made Missouri their ecclesiastical home. It is far from our thought that such men are playing a dishonest part. Our hope is that some of them can be won for the truth which the Ohio Synod confesses if they can be brought to give the subject earnest consideration. If the opposing party can entertain the same hope as regards their teaching, this could only lead them to agree with us that the conferences should be continued in the interest of saving truth and perishing souls.

Our people, however, should not overlook the fact that the advantage in this respect is on our side. Members of the Synodical Conference prior to the opening of the predestinarian controversy were taught the same doctrine which we were taught, and maintained it on the same grounds on which we are contending for it now. It is one of the merits of Missouri that it brought the old writers of the Lutheran Church to the attention of American Lutherans and led to their devout study. The doctrine which these writers teach on the controverted subject is precisely that for which the Ohio Synod is now in the providence of God called earnestly to contend. In the acceptance and teaching of this doctrine all the parties in the present controversy were fully agreed. Probably a large portion of the Synodical Conference is teaching the same doctrine from the pulpit and in the catechetical class still. At any rate those who never gave much attention to the warfare waged by the leaders of their organization against us and our fellow believers in the old doctrine of the Church, presumably to no inconsiderable extent retained their former position, while others followed the leaders without raising a question

of conscience in the matter or displaying much zeal in advocating the new departure. Our people "continued in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship," and had no change to make. But the Missourian doctrine was an innovation, and Missourians had a demand made upon them which required a change of position. That demand is made upon them still. Our conferences will force at least some to a decision before the rupture, which has already reached a cessation of church fellowship so far as the Missourian leaders are concerned, becomes fixed and final, and the Synodical Conference becomes a recognized portion of the Calvinistic Reformed Church, or a separate predestinarian sect. In some this decision may be in favor of the absolute predestination to salvation which Missouri teaches. To that the external connection with Missouri will be an incitement, because to that all the benefit of doubts will naturally inure. Only conscience will be likely to lead individuals to break with old associations, and to leave a body with which they have been long identified or into which their education has brought them. But conscience may lead some to protest with us against the Calvinistic innovation which is so comfortless to the individual and so embarrassing to the pastor, when it is seen that it is without Scriptural ground and that in its root it is just such a philosophical speculation as it is claimed to antagonize. It is to be hoped that some, in whom the truth unto salvation taught by the Lutheran Church has become a power to direct the thought and the life, will come to us as a result of our teaching and testimony.

No doubt it will to some seem indiscreet to say this. But as we have no interest in the matter but that of the truth of God as revealed in the Scriptures, we have nothing to conceal and nothing to veil. We desire that the old truth which once the contending parties confessed in common should prevail, and our hope is that the conferences will contribute to this end. This is our ardent desire and our cheering hope, as the peace and prosperity of the

Church which we love is all involved in this one thing, that the Word of our Lord may rule and reign among us.

But this is not all that we are constrained to say in behalf of the continuance of our conferences. We can hardly consider the doctrine of the Synodical Conference as formally and finally settled among the members of that body. Some of us remember the fluctuations in its presentation and defense years ago, when the new departure was made by the Missouri Synod under the able leadership of Dr. Walther. While the fundamental thought of an absolute divine election, determining who of the equally powerless souls constituting our lost race should become believers and be saved, was manifestly dominant, it was also manifest that many a step in its elaboration was taken without the firmness of tread which characterized Missourian leaders when they walked in the more familiar paths of our old theology. Explanations were made which seemed virtually reflections; propositions which had been laid down as important elements in the theory were subsequently dropped without expressly renouncing them; objections which struck at the very heart of the new doctrine were left unanswered; and silence was persisted in notwithstanding the most earnest efforts of men who sought the truth to elicit a reply. As opponents multiplied, prudence dictated an offensive warfare instead of a bold defense; but this was rendered doubly difficult by the fact that no effective blow could be aimed at us without striking the time-honored theologians of the Lutheran Church in its palmiest days, and thus condemning books which they had themselves cordially recommended and which were still in use in their churches and schools. It is no wonder that the controversy was permitted gradually to languish, while many a perplexing point remained unsettled and the new doctrine was lacking in clearness and definiteness.

Meantime the rent was made which is so much deplored. Our Ohio Synod with others who found no reason to abandon their old position, but who had ample reason to contend against the Calvinistic element which Missouri at-

tempted to introduce into the Lutheran Church, refused to accept the innovation or to pronounce it a thing of indifference, and Missouri declared that under such circumstances fraternal fellowship must cease, especially as they resented all imputations of Calvinism. But the very lack of any definite statement of its doctrine on the part of the Synodical Conference, while our doctrine is clearly set forth by all the prominent writers of the Lutheran Church since the days of the Formula of Concord, left many in doubt. Probably the synods that now form our opponents never knew how many of their members remained just as they were in the days when they still worked and worshiped in harmony with us.

In this strangely vague condition matters have been left in the Synodical Conference to this day. So far as we know there has been no attempt made to formulate an official statement of its doctrine or to reduce its teaching to a harmonious system. In view of pronouncements made by individual leaders this should not be expected and the lack of it should not seem strange. But these very pronouncements are as singular as the condition for which they appear designed to furnish a justification. The fact is plain, that many in the Synodical Conference do not know what they are expected to believe on the subject of predestination, and that among those who, in a general way, accept the Waltherian innovation there is often a divergence in particulars which is of no small moment in the doctrine as a whole. Hence not only those who have not definitely taken sides in favor of the Missouri doctrine, though they have remained in connection with the organization to which they had become accustomed, but even those who have stood as our declared opponents may be benefitted by a continuance of our conferences. The truth can only gain by getting a hearing.

True, the public discussions thus far held have apparently produced no definite results, and have opened no cheering prospects. But the time has hardly come for these. The subject in controversy is wide and has many

ramifications, or at least admits of branching out in various directions. Where many are engaged in the discussion it is not easy to concentrate attention on the essential points, or even to specify these and exclude irrelevant matter. We must not expect too much. More than a few days are requisite to find the exact point of difference. Our opponents have thus far failed to give a clear statement of the doctrine generally accepted among them, if such a general acceptance of any definite doctrine, particularly in its relation to other doctrines of our confession, may be legitimately assumed. So far scarcely anything more than a proximate and partial understanding of what the Synodical Conference believes has been attained. But that is something of value. If that body will not give us a clear and connected statement of its teaching we must gather it from such fragmentary declarations as its members are pleased to make. Eventually they will see the necessity of more complete statement, were it only to ward off what they might regard as misrepresentations of their views. That would be a great gain. A multitude may unreflectingly follow trusted leaders for a while, but the entrance of light upon the path which they have been pursuing without misgivings, because without suspicions that they are being led in any other than their accustomed ways, will probably awaken some to the need of investigating and making an intelligent choice before condemning us for remaining in a position which once their whole body occupied with us. We can be satisfied if only the truth has the opportunity to exert its power.

Apart from fear of results in our favor, our opponents' hostility to such thinking and ultimate choosing is probably not as deeply rooted and persistent as some of their utterances would seem to indicate. Some things that look desperate have indeed been said by individuals arrayed against us in the controversy. Occasionally in the ardor of debate remarks bordering on the absurd have been made by men who are expected to lead in the contest. It has seemed as if Missouri had decided to forbid all thinking, and to de-

nounce as Rationalism pure and simple every effort to understand the Bible and ascertain the revealed truths. To many the inference has not seemed uncharitable, that our opponents expect us to accept their decisions with the same credulity and the same finality as Romanists are expected to accept the decrees of the pope. Unquestionably the impression was made upon many among us, that the Missourians regarded us as incompetent to exercise the rights, if there are any, that may yet be accorded to human reason, and that accordingly it would be immodest, if not impudent, for a believer in the old truth which we once held in common to presume to render a reason against the new theory which caused the trouble. Apparently in this spirit were the common place instructions given us in logic and hermeneutics to the effect, that a conclusion is not valid when it is not contained in the premises and that an interpretation is not legitimate when the analogy is drawn from a false doctrine assumed to be taught in another passage. It puts the patience of the advocates of our old doctrine to a severe test when their use of John 3, 16 to throw light on some texts treating of election is referred to as an example of such false analogy, and the inference from it that God made equal provision for the salvation of all is adduced as an instance of such false logic. But it would not be generous, at this stage of the controversy, to consider such injudicious expressions and manifest blunders to be the settled and final position of our opponents. They cannot help but think, being human; and even in their minds false thinking cannot have the same authority and exert the same influence with that which is valid. As to the source of the material of thought, there is in fact no difference between us. The revelation given in the Scriptures is recognized by both parties as sufficient and as alone authority. May we not hope that when we come fully to understand each other in matters of this kind we will both be regarded as believers in the truth given by inspiration from heaven, and both be ready to hear when God speaks? Should we not at least, in spite of the discouragements so far presented, continue

to strive for the attainment of a still apparently possible removal of hindrances to an agreement?

Moreover, the Missourian position does not seem to us yet so settled even in the minds of leading opponents as to preclude all hope of betterment. However much in the interest of their new departure they may protest against what is shown to be the necessary implication of their allegations, and denounce as Rationalism the drawing of legitimate inferences from them, they cannot close their eyes to the fact that other people will not on that account cease to think, or be led, merely on their authority, to admit their claims without examination. They themselves cannot refrain from looking into the import of propositions and appealing to the same laws of thought which other people recognize. Nor are they unreasonable enough to assume that principles of interpretation which they are unwilling to apply in other cases, but which seem to them necessary to support their cause in regard to Bible texts treating of predestination, will be widely accepted in disregard of the whole history of sound exegesis. No doubt, on further reflection some will have misgivings about the foundation of their theory, and some will be willing to review the matter and revise their contentions.

The past has shown that such a hope is not unfounded. Later presentations of the doctrine by members of the Synodical Conference evince that further thought has been given to the subject. Changes have been made, and if these have not always been in the direction of the old doctrine of the Lutheran Church, they have shown that some positions formerly held were abandoned, although the Calvinistic element which caused the offense and led to the division was still maintained. But the reflection which led to changes in the direction of consistency may lead to further changes, and why should they not be in the direction of the old doctrine of our Lutheran fathers, who earnestly contended for the truth against every form of error, whether it came in the form of Romanism or of Calvinism? Missouri may settle down as a Calvinistic sect, and may strangely do this

at a time when Calvanistic sects are generally abandoning the Calvanistic theory as a lost cause, but we cannot regard that as a finality now, when the innovation has not yet assumed a fixed form and its somewhat heterogeneous parts have not yet crystallized into a definite creed. Missouri still has so much of distinctively Lutheran doctrine which is inconsistent with its predestinarian theory, that it would be pessimistic to suppose that the sound old Lutheran faith with its solid Biblical foundation, especially as the old Lutheran writers which they once so justly appreciated have so convincingly refuted the Calvinistic arguments which are now urged to support the Calvinistic innovation, would have no influence in the future development of Missourians. Whatever the outcome may be, we think that there is good reason to hope that at least some of those who are now arrayed against us will by the grace of God be enabled to se that their ground is untenable, and that Christian duty requires the abandonment of a position that causes division and impedes the progress of the great Church of the Reformation in its spread of the gospel in all lands.

In confirmation of our convictions we may refer to the most recent effort to present the doctrine of Missouri in an intelligible form. It seeks to give the theory a systematic statement, and thus furnishes what has been rarely attempted by our opponents. In the first place it is stated with clearness and candor, and with every semblance of full conviction, that salvation is designed and secured for all men alike and sincerely offered to all men. The universality of grace is thus fully admitted, and no effort is made to use ambiguous language which would leave room for any Calvinistic particularism. It is not the will of God that any should perish, and those who are lost have only themselves to blame. Indeed this is expressed with so much emphasis that if attention is fixed on this point alone it would be difficult to see how there could be any controversy between us. In the second place there is, apparently at least, an admission that faith is necessary to salvation. Ac-

cordingly while God wills the salvation of all men, the actual salvation is limited to them that believe. That such faith is wrought by God alone on the ground of His grace in Christ, is then set forth with all the fulness and force that would be desired. In this respect we stand on common ground, and it would seem strange if we could not rejoice together in the truth instead of combating each other. But in the third place it is now distinctly stated that the election of grace determines who among all our lost race shall become a believer, or, in other words, who by the power of God, who alone can work faith in the soul, shall have personal possession of the salvation which God has provided for all men. Whilst this reduces the new doctrine to something intelligible by assigning it a proper place in the plan of salvation, it is a distinct recognition of the Calvinistic element which made the trouble from the start, and which threatens to render all further conference futile. Perhaps so, but we are not yet ready to admit it, though quite sure that on our part no concessions can be made to Calvinism in any of its forms. We are disposed to regard the sound Lutheran doctrine which is still accepted as a leaven in their souls that may purge out the error of Calvinism that is struggling for ascendency.

We must admit that our opponents' insistence upon their assumption that the Bible teaches a particular grace, by which the universal grace in Christ is limited to comparatively few persons as the elect of God, whom alone He purposes to save, discourages such a cheering hope. But is possible that they do not mean all that they say when they try to make their contradiction plausible. They are right when they allege that our natural reason must not be allowed to rise in conflict with the special revelation which God has given us for our salvation from the darkness and death that sin has brought into the world, and can never be accepted as authority in matters of faith and conscience, where the Word given by inspiration of God alone must rule and reign. Our opponents cannot be admitted to have a deeper interest in the preservation of the

purity of the Word than God has granted to us. But that does not show that the Holy Scriptures never contain statements bearing implications that are not explicitly stated, or that they never leave anything to be inferred. We cannot for a moment suppose that, upon a closer examination, our opponents would maintain this as their abiding conviction. Their practice not only in the past, when there was no controversy between us, but also at the present time, aside from the particular doctrine in controversy, precludes such a supposition. We presume that not one of them would affirm, that when the Bible says that God so loved the world as to give it a Savior, there is no certainty that they are included, or that the inference that they too have a Savior has no divine foundation. The point of dispute can therefore only be whether an inference in any given case is valid. And in this respect we hope for some better insight on the part of our opponents regarding the matter in dispute. They admit that the Bible teaches the love of God towards our fallen race to be universal, that the redemption through the mission of His own dear Son is universal, that the operation of the Holy Spirit through the appointed means of grace is universal: is it not then reasonable and charitable to hope that some of them will some day see that it is in conflict with their own scriptural faith to contend, that in some unaccountable way all this wonderful plan of boundless grace has become limited and for the greater portion of the helpless souls for whose benefit it was formed has been invalidated and rendered nugatory by the same merciful God that formed it? For this is what it means when it is taught that the election of God decides who shall believe and be saved, notwithstanding the oft-repeated and emphatic declaration that God's will is that all should be saved, and that accordingly He has made the same gracious provision for the salvation of us all. And on what ground is this maintained? On the ground of an interpretation of the passages of the Bible treating of election that refuses to make due account of the other passages which set forth the universality of grace and en-

able us to aprehend the whole counsel of God, thus not only making the Bible contradict itself, but setting up a principle of hermeneutics that works perniciously in regard to other doctrines of Scripture, which they have hitherto in common with us regarded as precious. We reasonably presume that such an effort as has recently been made to show that the divine will to save all men and the divine will to save only a select and comparatively small number of men, cannot justly be said to be two contradictory wills, because the elect are brought to faith in Christ and their salvation is thus in accord with the universal plan of salvation, will not, on closer examination, be considered a safe refuge. Neither can the other theory which has been broached, that there are two distinct ways of salvation, one of which is the way of election, the other the way of universal grace, be supposed to become the position on which our opponents will make their final stand.

The latter opinion has this in its favor, that it seems to avoid the contradictory wills which are an offence to Christendom. But is evidently only seems so. When men are taught that God selects a certain portion of our race to salvation and supplies them with all that is needful to this end, they will naturally ask the question: what then becomes of the rest — has God no mercy for them? The Missourians answer that we must ask no questions when God speaks and decides a matter. Every sincere believer, who in the consciousness of sin flees for refuge to the free salvation offered in Christ through faith, accepts that. But all the more earnestly he seeks to learn from the Holy Scriptures what the will of the Lord is as revealed in the Scriptures regarding the matter before us. The question therefore recurs and presses for an answer. Our opponents do not even claim that there is no answer in the Bible. They admit that it is God's revealed will that all should be saved. They admit also that in pursuance of this will He sent His Son to redeem the whole world. The Calvinistic error has not so dominated their thinking that they explicitly restrict the efficacy of the means of grace to an elect few. Their

whole system of doctrine is still professedly that which we teach and which the Lutheran Church has confessed for centuries. Their new doctrine is plainly a misfit. Why then should we think it a waste of energy, so long as they will give us a hearing, to discuss the subject with them?

If our opponents adopted the Calvinistic System in its consistent development, the case would be different. But they concede so much to the old Lutheran position that it would be surprising if none of them could be brought to see whither they are tending and thus induced to retreat their steps. Why, if God explicitly and emphatically declares that He wills the salvation of all men and has made ample provision for the execution of His will, should He, by an interpretation of certain passages that ignores the substance of the gospel be made to say that He wills the salvation of only an elct number? And what by the will of God becomes then of the miserable and helpless many who are not among the elect? What is the use of conceding that there is a universal salvation when in the same breath it is alleged that God has decreed it to be particuar? Consistent Calvinists decline to stultify themselves by advocating such contradictions. Their system lays all the stress on an absolute election to faith and consequently denies the whole doctrine of salvation for all men. They therefore teach that while God has elected some to faith and salvation, He has also decreed that the others should be damned. The latter horrible decree our opponents have not accepted, and hence the inconsistencies that run through their efforts to explain and defend their system. Is it not as charitable as it is reasonable to hope, that a closer study of the subject will force our opponents to abandon their Calvinistic theory of absolute election in order to escape its complemental theory of absolute reprobation, as both rest on the same ground? If the election of a favored few is absolute, so that these are necessarily brought to faith in virtue of a divine decree that does not avail for the many, may not a more rigid study of the texts on which Calvinists base their doctrine of reprobation, lead some of them to see that

their exegetical principle as applied to election deprives their efforts to refuse the doctrine of reprobation of all convincing power, especially as the assumed absoluteness of the decree of election renders the still admitted universality of grace practically useless? This remains true even when the opinion is held that there are coordinate plans of salvation, one by particular election and the other by universal grace; for even if such a theological novelty could be rendered plausible to a few peculiarly constituted minds the difficulty would still remain essentially the same. Besides introducing new complications with their attendant perplexities, the contradiction would continue as before; for if the election is the decree of God's will deciding who shall believe and be saved, as our opponents maintain, what must become of those who are not included in this election? Referring them to the other plan of salvation by universal grace would avail nothing so long as it is taught that God elects those whom He has purposed to save. Speaking of another effectual will of God for the salvation of helpless sinners can have no meaning in the face of such predestinarian views. If by the will of God only the elect are saved, by what will could any of those be saved who are not among the elect? Manifestly the doctrine of universal grace can stand only if the Calvinistic opinion of a special divine decree limiting its operation to a favored few who are elected for the purpose is abandoned as contradictory to the divine plan of salvation for all through faith in the Redeemer who died for all.

We cannot but think it right and proper, in view of the situation, to cherish the hope that some impression can still be made upon some of our opponents by continuing to present the truth as the Bible teaches it for all men's enlightenment and salvation, and that some benefit can thus be conferred upon the Church which confesses the truth and, knowing its power and its worth, earnestly contends for the faith once delivered to the saints. We are not forgetting the contention of our opponents, that they are merely urging the doctrine of Holy Scripture and endeavoring to uphold

the authority of the Word. So far as that is their sincere purpose we honor them for it. In these times especially, when Satan's forces are mustered in fiercest battle array against Christ and His kingdom, this is superlatively needful. In that respect we know ourselves cordially at one with our opponents. But so far are we from forgetting this that it only furnishes an additional reason for hoping that our labor in this respect will not be in vain in the Lord. The confusion and inconsistencies and contradictions apparent in the new doctrine of the Synodical Conference are not in the Bible. That teaches a plain way of salvation through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. They are only in the false thinking of our opponents. They make the contradictions, and feel themselves authorized to rebuke us because we dcline to take our reason captive under the authority thus proclaimed. Certainly if it were our Lord's authority, all true Christians would be willing to submit, though what is required antagonized all our natural reason and feeling and will: for who are we, poor, forlorn, condemned sinners, that we should presume to fight against God? But when men refuse to hear the whole counsel of God and by a vicious use of their own reason set the parts of that counsel as revealed in the Scriptures against each other, some even among themselves, being sincere in their love of truth, may be expected to abandon their antagonism to the revealed plan of salvation and join us in the defense of the whole counsel of God against the wily foe, who knows how to make use of every such aberration as our opponents manifest in their teaching and of every division that is thus effected in the forces of Christendom.

There is another point which affords room for profitable conference in the place which our opponents assign to faith in their theory of election, and much to encourage the hope that further discussion and reflection will be productive of deeper insight into the whole subject under dispute, and thus to the rejection of error. Our opponents do not deny the necessity of faith in the order of salvation. But

they strenuously insist on election independently of faith, and denounce as an error the doctrine that it is taken into account in the divine choice of persons who shall be saved. As they treat it, faith in Christ does not decide who shall be saved. That is decided by election, which at the same time decides that the persons elected shall become believers. Election in view of faith, as the Lutheran Church has taught it for centuries, they will not admit. Faith in Christ is thus persistently denied to be the condition of salvation. Not that they rule it out when the way of life is to be shown. But so far as appears from their statements it is only one of the stages in the path by which God is pleased to lead those whom He proposes to save. It thus has the same position in the way to heaven which is assigned to holiness or good works. Its efficacy in the eternal counsels of God as the exclusive means by which the merits of Christ are appropriated by the individual, so that only he that believeth shall be saved and without faith it is impossible to please God, is not recognized. Somehow Christ is supposed to avail for some people without being apprehended by faith, and for the others does not avail at all. There needs no faith to be elected unto salvation, which depends on nothing but the absolute will of God with regard to certain select persons. In the divine economy of grace faith comes in after the question of salvation is settled. Certain persons are elected unto salvation and therefore unto faith. The election is not indeed taught to be independent of the merits of Christ, though occasional utterances of members of the Synodical Conference squint that way, but the necessity of apprehending Christ by faith before the individual can share the benefit of Christ's atonement is denied. Hence the strenuous opposition to the doctrine of election in view of faith, and hence too the equally determined resistance to applying the analogy of faith in the explanation of Scripture passages referring to election. So persistent is the struggle of our opponents to assign to faith a different position and office, from that which it has always occupied in the Lutheran Church, that under their predestinarian ma-

nipulation even the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith suffers a change which, to say the least, deprives it of much of its Biblical clearness and comfort. May we not hope that some of our opponents may yet be induced to repudiate an innovation that is so signally at war with the whole faith of the Lutheran Church and threatens to overthrow her entire system of theology? It would be a comfort to us to be accused by honest opponents that we have misunderstood their theory, if they can only be led to repudiate what we understand them to teach and to confess with us the old truth which Missouri once confessed in common with Ohio.

One more consideration encourages the hope that our Conferences will not be without benefit. The practical side of Missouri's new departure will demand further thought before clearness is attained and such thought will lead to further reflection on the constituent parts of the new theory. It was claimed in the beginning of the controversy that there is great consolation in the propounded scheme of election. So far as we have been able to observe, that never became quite apparent even to our opponents. Probably it occurred to them that consolation would flow to individuals from their absolute election only if they could be made certain that they belong to the few who are thus elected. How should they obtain such certainty? They would not derive it from the Word of God; for this does not expressly mention them as thus distinguished, and thus leaves them on a level with other sinners. They could not derive it by inference from plain declarations of the Bible; for, to say nothing of the disfavor into which all inference has fallen among them as proof, there are no promises given from which a legitimate conclusion in their favor could be drawn, inasmuch as the only possible inference, that they are among the elect because they are believers, is rendered invalid by the still admitted fact that there are believers who are not elect. The only possible assurance must therefore come from a special revelation informing the individual that he is among the selected few who shall be

saved. For such a fanatical solution our opponents were not and are not now ready, and they have therefore been content with us to find their comfort in the gospel promise of grace in Christ through faith in His name. The most recent essay to find a source of comfort in the new theory must in the same way prove a failure. It runs substantially thus, that when unconverted sinners are addressed we must preach salvation in Christ and say nothing of election; that when any resist, we must preach the terrors of the law, that they may reflect before it is too late; that those who believe are to be comforted by their election, that they may be duly thankful; but that when a Christian falls into doubt whether he belongs to the elect, we must refer him to the universal promises of God, that the grace revealed in Christ for all men may sustain him and minister consolation. No advance is thus shown in making the new Missourian doctrine available in practice. It seems rather to be felt as an encumberance, since every effort made to draw comfort from it results in directing attention to its inherent untenableness. The expectation of winning lost souls by telling them that God purposes to save an elect few of them is preposterous, and our opponents are wise in recommending that nothing be said about it to the unconverted. But would it not be equally wise to observe the same discreet silence in the case of the converted, seeing that the effect of preaching it could only awaken doubts in their minds as to whether they are among the elect? That Missourians are willing in such cases to apply the comfort contained in the pure gospel of the universal grace of God securing salvation equally for all men in Christ, is highly commendable. But may we not hope that by and by at least some of them can be brought to see that this comfort is not available so long as they continue to teach the absolute election of a few to salvation, which is the source of the trouble thus sought to be removed? They can minister consolation by the way which they suggest only by abandoning their innovation, which blocks the way of consolation pointed out by the Lutheran Church from the start, and that they will see the

force of the argument, though it rest on an inference that a doctrine that robs the soul of the comfort of the gospel cannot be of God.

Missourians are always ready to assure us that we are here dealing with a great mystery, and that we must humbly and unhesitatingly accept it. But accept what? No doubt some of them can be induced to give serious attention to that question, though it may be startling to some. It has been anounced that the absolute election of a few to salvation, notwithstanding God's proclamation of pardon to all through faith in His Son who was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification must be accepted by faith as a divine mystery. But why not rather accept universal grace in Christ, as so frequently and so amply and so emphatically declared in Scripture, notwithstanding the passages which treat of the election of a few among those that are called, especially as this accords with the divine plan of salvation by faith? The mystery would thus be solved and the plan of salvation revealed in the Scriptures be preserved as a consistent whole. The mystery is not at all where our opponents unjustly place it. It is not at all how God could will the salvation of all, and still, when it comes to the test, will the salvation of only a few. That is simply not true, and to one whose faith clings to the promise of universal grace can never by any process of reasoning be made to appear true in such sense as to be a source of comfort in view of the curse which sin has entailed. The mystery in the matter is how lost souls, when God, in whom alone is our help, offers salvation to all alike and with the offer bestows the grace necessary to embrace it, can be such consummate fools as to stubbornly reject it, thus adding to the folly imbedded in their nature, which they cannot help, the superlative folly of a personal choice, which by the grace of God they could help. Why, if God elect some to salvation and gives them faith because He elects them, some believe and others do not, is plainly no mystery at all. It is made a mystery only by a false interpretation of the texts on election, in virtue of which God, who clearly reveals

His merciful plan of universal salvation, is represented as for some inscrutable reason practically making that plan particular, while according to the Scriptures man alone is responsible for the particularism. Let us hope that some of our opponents can yet be brought to see their error, and cease from imputing to God their contradictions and inconsistencies, calling the product a divine mystery and expecting others to stand in awe before it and keep silence. The matter is certainly serious enough to invite further discussion.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

PROFESSOR TH. MEES, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

I.

It is a notable fact, that within the last two decades educational methods, both here and abroad, have been revolutionized to an extent little realized by such as are not more or less professionally interested in the matter. The organization of schools, teaching material and personnel show a marked improvement over "olden times," which appeal even to the unprofessional understanding; but important as these changes are, they represent only the more external side of modern education and are really the result of the more important advances made on the side of pedagogical principles and methods. Education is now recognized both as a science and an art, the former in so far as it is based on sound principles and laws, the latter, in so far as it requires professional training and practice. Results in education are no longer made dependent on experiments, or on the natural talent of the teacher, but are determined as logical inferences from proven premises, which, under normal conditions, are valid.

Instructive as an extended review of this evolution in the field of education might be for readers of this periodical, on account of its paramount importance for the development of future generations, both intellectually and morally,

it is not my intention to discuss the technical features of the question further, than to present the basic principles in their application to my present purpose. It has been my privilege during my connection with our Teachers' Seminary to instruct and to train a number of young men on these lines, to serve as teachers in our parochial schools, and the results are the proof of the argument, so far as principles are concerned. If I now essay to apply the same methods to the Sunday-school, mutatis mutandis, I am actuated by a desire to elevate this adjunct of our modern church life to the highest possible plane of usefulness, keeping in mind the natural defects which attach to the system, and the degree of efficiency to which we can under the circumstances aspire. The ideal system is the parochial school in conjunction with the "Christenlehre." But even where parochial schools are maintained, it has been thought advisable to continue the Sunday School for reasons which need not be discussed in this place. This very fact would seem to warrant an attempt to bring the two systems in harmony in order to secure the best results, two branches on the same tree, nourished by the same sap, and bearing the same fruit.

The question, How to improve our Sunday Schools, gains in importance at the present moment, since Synod is about to publish a series of text-books to be adapted especially for use in such schools. It is reasonable to assume, that it is the desire of the authorized persons to compile a series that shall command confidence at the outset, that is based on sound pedagogical methods, conforms to the peculiar genius of our Lutheron Church, and can be produced at a reasonable cost; a difficult task, but, in my estimation, not insurmountable. If it be clearly understood, what our Sunday Schools *can* and *should* accomplish, if the ends to be attained be not extravagantly elevated, if the aim be not set too far, I can conceive of no reason why a useful series of text-books should not be issued within our limited means. On the other hand, if an attempt be made to

broaden the work of the school beyond its legitimate scope, I fear that another failure must be recorded.

An admirable beginning for intelligent discussion of the question has been made by A. O. S. in a series of articles in the *Lutheran Standard,* in which principles have been laid down that are eminently sound and practical. If I venture to tread the same ground in this paper, it is not in a spirit of antagonism, but rather with the desire to set forth in a systematic form the matter in question, and to offer practical suggestions, how to organize a Sunday School, that the material offered may be readily and efficiently manipulated.

In order to understand the principles upon which the selection of the matter for instruction, and the method according to which it is to be presented are based, it may be well briefly to discuss some pedagogical axioms, now generally accepted by competent authorities the world over.

All instruction must readily attach itself to concepts and concept groups present in the soul of the child and clearly defined in its consciousness. The teacher can succeed only in so far as he knows the content of the mind upon which he seeks to act, and the laws according to which mind reacts upon a certain stimulus. Given certain stimuli which the teacher may apply, the pupil must respond to them in a definite way. This is what is frequently called "creating interest," and it is well, if we know precisely *how* to do it. It is important for the complete success of apperception (which is the transformation of a new weaker concept by means of an older one, surpassing the former in power and inner organization), that consciousness concern itself exclusively with that which is to be appropriated, and to let everything foreign to it alone; to permit only such ideas to rise as have some relation to the new; in short, that consciousness consentrate itself upon the new. This concentration of consciousness, for the purpose of securing an accession of ideas, we call *attention.*

This attention may be voluntary or involuntary. In involuntary attention we do not attend for the sake of the

object itself, but because of some emotional accompaniment. This emotional element arouses our *interest* in the object with which it is connected. Attention then naturally follows interest. Interest may be said to hold the same relation to involuntary attention that the will holds to voluntary. In involuntary attention the object plays the leading part, in voluntary attention the soul. The same forces are at work in both cases, though not in the same proportion. There is a regular series from the almost purely will-less attention which a young child gives to a bright light, up to the intense attention that the scientist bestows upon the examination of the spectrum analysis of some rare substance. In any given state of attention, the less the interest, the greater the amount of will-power necessary to maintain it. One of the main aims of education is to enable the pupil to pass from the purely involuntary to the purely voluntary forms of attention; yet so peculiarly close and intricate are the relations of these two forms of attention, that, in a certain sense, the converse is true, and the functions of education may be regarded as the creation of involuntary attention through voluntary attention. While voluntary and involuntary attention differ, as we have seen, the mechanism which they call into play is exactly the same. In both cases we have the concentration of mental force upon a limited area. This means, that force must be drawn *from* certain parts. Attention is *inhibition*, i. e. we do not really direct our attention to this or that object, we simply call it off from all other objects. In all this *attention* follows interest.

At first sight it may seem that the converse may be maintained with equal truth, for in many cases interest certainly does follow attention. If we take up some ordinary object, say an old-fashioned key and direct all our attention to it, the result is that a certain amount of interest is developed. But while it is true, that the greater the interest in an object, the greater the attention we give it will be, the converse does not hold true. It is not true, that the greater the attention, the greater the interest. Interest de-

pends upon the apperception masses that can be brought into relation with the given object. Attention cannot create such masses, it can only give them a chance to rise into consciousness. Teachers therefore can not really *create,* but can only direct attention. The most careless boy in school is not without attention nor without interest; the trouble is that he is interested in wrong things and naturally attends to that which interests him. If then the teacher can so arrange his object, that a new interest will be substituted for the old, the child cannot but choose to attend. The attion follows whatever attracts it; interest is paramount. At a later stage the contents of the mind are so arranged and organized, that attention can be maintained in certain directions with the minimum of interest.

It would seem then that the process of education consists in the systematic elimination of interest. This is true in so far that interest is continually being eliminated from certain mental processes and *transferred to others.* Each loss of interest is accompanied by the development of a new interest. Sometimes a clergyman enlivens a sermon by introducing a story. If the story is worked into the fibre of the address, so that it could not be withdrawn without affecting the whole bearing of the argument, the interest aroused by the story is legitimate. But if the stories are introduced into a discourse "as raisins into a pudding," merely to enrich it, the interest aroused is illegitimate. The audience prick up their ears, till the story is told. Their interest dies with the story. Thus one interest is substituted for another, and so far from aiding the speaker actually hinders him. A rival interest to the discourse is created. To conclude, to be interesting, a thing must find a natural place for itself in the cosmas of the child's mind. An entirely unknown thing can have no interest whatever for a child. Teaching consists in finding or forming suitable place for itself in the cosmos of the child's mind. An enterest really depends on the content of the soul.

Applying these principles as expressed in the proposition at the beginning, we can arrive at a definite conclu-

sion as to the matter, which should form the basis of religious instruction in our Sunday Schools. Nothing has so much the power to interest the children, and consequently to gain their attention, as the *story*. And since all Revelation of God's plan for the salvation of man is given us in the garb of historical development, and not in a series of detached aphoristic maxims, we have at hand the material in a form which at once appeals to the interest of the child, in short, Bible Histories. The eminent teacher and pedagogue Kehr beautifully expresses the value of Bible Histories thus: "They present to the child's soul religious characters, in whom religion becomes, as it were, embodied and in whom it first learns to understand and to love religious life. They introduce the child into a marvelous spiritual world which deeply moves the soul, and exhibit in them the blessing of the fear of God, the curse of sin, and the mercy of the eternal God, who breaketh not the bruised reed and quencheth not the smoking flax. . . About their trunk twine Christian doctrine and religious life so harmoniously, that for religious instruction in the school we shall never have a more natural and Christian pedagogic foundation than the Bible Histories. If the teacher never forgets, that the mere knowledge of Bible Histories is of minor importance, that their main purpose is to awaken religion in the child, to rouse it to godly sentiments, to sanctify the will and increase moral strength; if he relates carefully selected histories so vividly, that the child beholds with its mental eye what it hears with its bodily ear; if he depicts events in such a warm hearted manner, that the child becomes so absorbed in the circumstances and events of the history, that it personally feels, and lives in. all that happened to the persons presented: . . then Bible History lessons are blessed hours and religious instruction in the highest sense of the word."

It will appear from the above, that the Bible Histories must form the *basis* of all instruction in the Sunday School through all grades, from the so-called primary department through to the highest classes, embracing even the catechu-

mens, i. e., for all children from the fifth and sixth years to the thirteenth and fourteenth, excluding only the confirmed members, who will form a Bible-class with a methodical instruction, as will appear later. The suggestion has been made to provide *charts* for the smaller children, from which the instruction should proceed on the basis of pictorial representation. I fail to see the utility of this device, which only complicates the mental process in the child's mind. The picture itself conveys nothing to the child's soul without the accompanying words of the teacher, the explanation must fill it with a definite content. While the eyes of the pupils attach themselves to the figures and seek to master the details, the ear is expected to hear the story and harmonize it with the representation. The result is in direct conflict with the axiom, that *one* interest must rule supreme in order to secure attention. Either the picture will be the controlling interest (and that will be the rule), or the narration, and in that case the picture is superfluous. A conflict of interest will invariably destroy attention and in a greater or less degree thwart the purpose in view. A well designed picture is of decided value, but only *after* the story has been told and after the child has become familiar with the persons and circumstances. It will then have its legitimate place in the methodical scheme by fixing, through the assistance of the eye, what already has become the property of the soul through the ear, and by stimulating the *imagination* of the child, properly directed through skillful questioning — a powerful factor in education. A noted educator, Guth, draws attention to another serious disadvantage: "Since biblical pictures generally can represent only one characteristic moment, which as a rule will appear in the middle or at the end of the story, the treatment of the picture must adopt, both a progressive and retrogressive course, by which the young child becomes utterly confused. The historical sequence of the relation cannot be fixed through such analytical procedure, and as a result the child cannot intelligently repeat the story."

All instruction must be objective, that is, it must proceed from the concrete to the abstract. True, the children of Christian families can be presumed to bring a fund of ethical religious ideas into the school, which they have gathered from their home influence and surroundings as a personal experience, and it is proper and useful to utilize these in the course of instruction; but they will not suffice. Here again the Bible Histories furnish an inexhaustible source of object material preeminently adapted to the various degrees of mental and spiritual development of the child. All the individual histories present to us views of our own life and experience, in each one of them we see ourselves. In the characters we learn to see reflected our own nature; in the guidance, correction, reproof, punishment and reward of Biblical personages the type of God's dealings with us. Understanding these, we learn to understand God's plan with reference to ourselves; and as Bible History is a vast Mosaic showing God's beneficent will and control over all mankind, so these individual stories will gradually shape themselves into a beautiful total concept of our own life and the divine direction of it.

This by no means implies, that the catechism, Bible verses and hymns shall not be learned. On the contrary, all enter as integral parts into the scheme of instruction, but in such a manner, that the religious and ethical idea developed from the history, finds its adequate expression and terse summary in one or the other, or in all three. I do not subscribe to the rule of some writers, who would eliminate all matter which can not be thoroughly grasped and perfectly understood by the child, from religious instruction. So much must be conceded that, if, there be no point of contact whatever in the child's soul, where a religious truth presented to it may find a response, where no apperception is possible, all endeavor will be futile. But that is not the case, when the Scriptural passages are carefully selected. Some part of them can and will be understood by the child, and what is not perfectly clear at once, will slumber in the soul as a germ capable of development at the proper time,

for God's word is life and creates life. But we can, by supplying a suitable soil, hasten this germination in a remarkable degree and promote its maturing to a blessed fruitfulness. Says Ferd. Lentz: "What then appears to be more reasonable, what more natural, than to connect Bible passages with the life-pictures as contained in Bible Histories. Thus, for example, the effect of the verce: For the wages of sin is death, will be far more powerful upon the mind and soul of the child, when it is learned on the background of the history of the Deluge. How wonderfully God leadeth His children, Isa. 28, 29; 1 Pet. 5, 7 will be deeply engraved upon the hearts through means of Joseph's story. . . . Thus the history is placed in the service of the Biblical passage. But conversely the Bible verse serves the history. . . . Verse and hymn then have the purpose to gather into a focus the impressions gained from the history and to cause them to influence the heart more directly through a terse and striking form of expression."

Remembering that the educators quoted above design this method for parish schools, in which religious instruction is the *daily,* prominent feature, and that they would have it continued through a course of eight years, the arguments would apply with tenfold force to schools, in which at best a half-hour of instruction weekly is available, and in which children of the most varied degrees of knowledge, or rather ignorance, in spiritual things are enrolled, whose great number furthermore makes impossible a more individual and direct instruction.

THEOLOGY AND THE SCRIPTURES.

PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O

Which is the mistress, theology or the Bible? In this question is found the kernel of the dispute between the old theology and the new, between the "advanced" and the conservative. In accordance with traditional views of

Protestantism, theology is the handmaiden of the Scriptures, being content to find its highest goal and purpose in the systematic presentation and practical application of what the Scriptures say and teach. The Scriptures themselves were regarded as the last court of appeals in all matters of theological research. The Protestant Church from the days of the Reformation sets up as its formal principle that the Scriptures and these alone are absolutely decisive in all problems of faith and life. Theology has nothing else to do than to determine what the Scriptures actually say, and then to make use of the results of this investigation for its own ends and purposes. It is for this reason that not unfrequently the very name of science has been denied to theology; and this denial is well founded if the term science includes an independent judgment on the part of the student as to the merits or demerits of the materials which he is to handle. Theology as defined by the older school of theologians takes the materials as it finds these in the Scriptures, but does not pass on the quality or merit of these materials in themselves or in their usefulness or adaptability for its purposes. It simply *must* use this matter as it finds it.

Modern theology has made a radical departure in this regard. The Scriptures themselves have become the object of criticism. The purpose is to discriminate between the divine and the human, in the Word itself, to discover by the laws of the mind and of literary criticism what portions of the Scriptures are to be regarded as authoritative and what portions can be discarded as the human element and hence not only capable of errors but actually full of errors. In other words, it is the function of theology according to modern notions to sit in judgment on the Scriptures and the order has been inverted, so that now theology is the mistress and the Bible the servant; the former is the superior and the latter is subordinated to the former's dictation. Theology is considered not only independent of the Scriptures, with principles and canons based on other grounds than the Scriptures, but can go directly counter to the very

claims and teachings of the Word itself; even against the teachings of Christ. It is, e. g., recognized by even the most radical protagonists of the critical school that Christ and the New Testament consider the Pentateuch the work of Moses, the second part of Isaiah, chapters 40-66, as the production of the Isaiah of history, the book of Daniel in accordance with the explicit claims of this book itself, the work of the prophet himself in Babylon; yet critical theology, for reasons of its own, and in accordance with a "scientific" process developed entirely independently of the Scriptures, denies each and every one of these things and insists upon its rights to pass judgment upon the claims of both the Scriptures and of Christ and His apostles. Theology is accordingly *above* and *over* the Scriptures: is not the handmaiden and the servant, but is the superior and ruler.

From this statement of the *status controversiae* it is at once apparent that the modern conception of both the Scriptures and of theology differs radically from those that obtain in the old. In fact there is involved in this nothing less than the formal principle of the Reformation, the very life of the Evangelical Church. The matter is an *articulus stantis et candentis ecclesiae.* If the newer views should prevail Protestantism would cease to be what it has been since the days of Luther; indeed it would no longer be Protestantism. As soon as an organization discards its vital and fundamental principle, it is undone; and the general or final adoption of the newer views on the Scriptures and on theology would be an act of suicide on the part of the Protestant Church. The Reformation substituted for the principle of the authority of the Church and the Hierarchy, the principle of the sole authority of the Bible. If now the authority of the Bible is discarded and the Scriptures themselves put under the bondage of a theology that in its essentials is drawn from other sources than the Bible, then Protestantism ceases to have its "reason for existence." It is accordingly a matter of prime and vital importance to determine exactly the relationship that exists between

theology and the Scriptures, and the answer must depend upon the character of the Scriptures.

There can be no complaint on the score that the Scriptures do not receive their fair share of attention on the part of modern scholarship. Biblical problems are on the contrary very popular in our day, not only in church circles but among thinking and non-thinking people in general. When a book like Harnack's "Essence of Christianity" is called for in more than fifty thousand copies in the original and in ten or twelve translations and when the superficial Babel-Bibel lectures of Delitzsch can be sold to the number of more than one hundred thousand copies and the "Replies" to this pamphlet appear by the dozen in successive editions, it can certainly not be said that our people are indifferent to religious problems and that they will not buy and read religious publications. It is only in exceptional cases that even the most popular of modern novels can boast of sales outnumbering the Harnack and Delitzsch publications. A glance at the periodical literature of the times also show that Biblical problems are before the public. Even, to such technical questions as the analysis and composition of the Pentateuch space is given in such leading popular journals as the Century, the editors of which certainly have their fingers on the public pulse and know what people will read and what they will not read. What problem is more popular now than the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament? Nearly every reader, wise and otherwise, is interested in the matter and considers himself a competent judge to pass on its merits and demerits. The Bible is indeed the cynosure of all eyes at present and the question as to its character, origin, inspiration, authority and the like are sure to appeal to large and interested audiences. In a word, the Bible is in the forefront of public thought and discussion as probably at no other period. Biblical problems are now popular.

But this is not an unmixed good. It would be if the higher object and purpose of this interest were to accept the

teachings of the Scriptures with a heart full of faith and confidence and to be guided by the truth that God has revealed to man through the merits of the prophets, evangelists and apostles. But this interest in the Word is not based on the belief that in the Scriptures we have a work that is *sui generis,* a divine Revelation of truth that otherwise would not be accessible to man. Not to learn from the Scriptures but to master the Scriptures is the heart motive in much of this popular interest in the Bible. If there is one tendency apparent it is the purpose to make the Scripture in its origin and contents one of a kind with other national literature of the world. It is indeed a religious book, and perhaps the best of its kind, but only one of a kind. Largely does modern scholarship concern itself with the Bible in order to find naturalistic explanations for the genesis and development of religious thoughts and feelings, to develop a philosophy of religion on the basis of the Scriptures but with constant reference to the religious teachings of other books and nations. The new science called "History of Religions" ("Religionsgeschichte"), which seeks to unfold from crude but naturalistic elements the religious belief of even the most cultured without the intervention or assitance of a divine Revelation, has cast its spell upon the Biblical research of our day, and it is largely from this point of view that the popular interest in Scripture problems must be explained. It is anything and everything in the world else than seeking the truth that leads to salvation that is the bottom motive in the concern for Biblical matters now-a-days; it is rather the fact that in the Scriptures are sought the data and the details for the elaboration of a philosophy of religion, higher indeed yet not generally or fundamentally different from that taken from other sources, that explains the popular interest here discussed. The Bible has not gained by this increased interest; it has lost indeed, being degraded to the level of a book of human religious thought. Modern "scientific" conceptions of the Bible are intrinsically lower than even the most mechanical conceptions of it advocated by the orthodox classes.

. That this is the modern conception of the Scriptures as advocated by the "advanced" thinkers is evident at a glance. What this position practically involves is not difficult to determine. It naturally discards the divine character of the Word and more specifically its inspiration. The books of the Bible are a composite, only the better class of the moderns admitting even the presence of the divine factor. In such books as Stade's *Geschichte Israel* there is absolutely no difference recognized between the canonical and the apocryphal books as sources of information for the determination of what the religion of the Old Testament is, and both classes of writings are subjected to the same principles of "historical criticism" to decide what their contents are worth, or how much truth they contain and how much falsehood. In this way the Scriptures as the object with which theology has to deal have become something entirely new. Instead of being the infallible and revealed Word of God, which theology must only study as to their *ipse dixit* and be content with the result, the Scriptures are now merely the literary remains of Israel, that furnish in a purely human way the evidences of what the religious development in Israel was, and the ordinary canons of literary and historical criticism must decide what is truth and what is error in these writings.

From this viewpoint the relation between Theology and the Scriptures too becomes an entirely new one. Indeed theology becomes a science practically independent of the Scriptures as far as its fundamental principles and rules are concerned. It approaches the Scriptures with a fixed set of rules, secured from philosophical and historical sources, as to what in the Scriptures must be true and what is false. Theology really becomes a philosophy and ceases to be a distinctively Christian or Biblical science. Thus, e. g. modern theology has learned that it is impossible that the order of nature's laws should be broken through, and that accordingly miracles are an impossibility. This is one of the teachings of what is now-a-days called "science;" and with this pre-supposition the critic approaches the Scriptures and

naturally is called upon to discard as "unhistorical" scores of reports in both the Old and the New Testament, which profess and claim to report miracles as an evidence of the power of God and His Christ. The bulk of modern theology in its "advanced" stage of development comes to the Bible as a *fait accompli,* it is essentially the product of rationalistic thought and is therefore too only an old error in a new form. It is a misnomer to call this science a "theology," and still more incorrect to call it "Biblical. The Bible is to it neither a source of principles nor a norm or rule, but merely furnishes it with the data and materials upon which it tests its preconceived notions as to what religion in origin and historical development ought to be. Never has there been a "science" less justified in claiming this distinction. If science is an unprejudiced examination of and objective judgment of the data and facts in a certain department of research, the principles to be developed from the genius and character of these data and facts, then modern theology is anything but a science. It is merely the application to the Scriptures of rules and canons taken from departments of research which differ in kind and character from the Scriptural. These rules and canons are really taken from a study of natural phenomena, from the field of nature, and not even from a fair study of these, but from one prejudiced by atheism and rationalism. Indeed modern theology is a scheme of philosophical naturalism and it purposes to force upon the Scriptures, which in every fibre betray that they are not naturalistic in contents or origin, this naturalism, this "religion of the era of Darwin." Modern theology is a bundle of prejudgments based on naturalism and from this point of view purposes to master the Scriptures.

On the other hand the old theology finds its glory in subordinating itself to the Word of God. It must be frankly acknowledged that it too does not propose to approach the Scriptures without prejudgments. It starts out from the standpoint that the Scriptures are the inspired Word of God and hence the last court of appeal. But it

differs from the newer theology in this characteristic feature that this prejudgment is not taken from without the Scriptures but from the Scriptures themselves. It is the working of the Spirit through the Word, the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti,* of the Lutheran Church fathers that furnishes the theologian with the certainty on the authority of the Word. True this is a matter that cannot be demonstrated by logic or historical or archæological evidence, but this does not make the certainty less certain. This matter of the inspiration of the Scriptures, the theologian like the average Christian must settle to his own personal satisfaction between his conscience and his God. It is a matter of faith; the product of the Spirit's influence, the gift of grace. The old charge that this method of attaining certainty is an *argumentum in circulo* is groundless, more seeming than real. The Scriptures as such, the whole Scriptures and in its parts, arouses in the Christian the conviction of their inspired character, and this in turn assures the Christian that the Scriptures in all their details and in all their particulars are the eternal truth. With this ground of assurance theology can operate and do its work, and it is only in this way that theology secures a firm foundation, more substantial than anything that "science" can furnish.

There are actually no reasons for changing the relationship that traditionally exists in Protestant and especially in Lutheran theology between theology and the Scriptures. The Scriptures stand on their own basis and furnish their own evidence of their truthfulness and truth; theology accepts this and on this basis constructs its dogmatical and ethical schemes and makes its practical applications in all the departments of congregational and individual life. Theology is still the queen among the sciences, but it is such only when it is the humble servant of the Scriptures. Its glory and its greatness consist not in its "scientific" character, but in its fidelity to the teachings of the Written Word.

OUR PRACTICAL ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHER LUTHERAN BODIES.*

REV. A. O. SWINEHART, A. B., ATTICA, O.

In setting down the above subject, something has been added to what was originally assigned, which was simply: The Position of the Different Lutheran Synods. It has seemed most probable, however, that the practical attitude toward the various bodies was really aimed at in assigning this subject. What the position of the various leading bodies really is, is so well known among us, as barely to leave room for fruitful treatment, particularly in the brief time that can be allotted for discussion at a local conference. At any rate, the knowledge of these various positions is to a considerable extent taken for granted in the work here to follow.

For lack of time, in part, exhaustive treatment of the subject aimed at is also not attempted. Nor are all the synods here considered. Bodies like the Icelandic, Danish and Norwegian synods are so separated from us by linguistic barriers, that, though we have a warm interest in their welfare, we do not come into much practical contact with them. With some of these bodies, as also with others, such as the Michigan and Buffalo synods, another reason for very limited practical contact is the smallness of their numbers. Yet it cannot be denied that as these bodies grow, and as their transition toward English progresses, our practical attitude toward them will also become more important. One body deserves mention, though it is not later given any special treatment, namely, the United Synod of the South. While this is a comparatively small body, it covers a large field that is also largely cultivated by our own synod, and in the same language while their confessional status is better than that of the General Synod, yet practically, their position

* Paper read before the Quarterly Conference of Crawford and adjacent counties.

is most nearly akin to that of the latter body, with which it is also more closely affiliated than with any other.

The great bodies requiring special treatment in an essay of this kind, and which probably were also referred to when this work was asigned, are the Synodical Conference, the General Council, the German Iowa Synod and the General Synod. What advice are we to give members of our churches removing to places represented by churches of these various synods, but not by any of our own? What should be our course of procedure about establishing missions at such places? And where we occupy fields that are also occupied by these various synods, what should be our course of conduct toward their pastors and congregations? These are practical questions which we will attempt to discuss, and to incite further discussion of the same by the conference.

Dealing with the churches of the Synodical Conference, and advising our people with regard to them, presents grave difficulties. Very great is indeed their error. In fact, to quote a writer in our Theological Magazine, "the doctrine of predestination and election, as evolved by modern Missouri, appears to be the only grave error which has insinuated itself into any considerable section of the Lutheran Church." Here is evidently danger for souls. A little leaven may leaven the whole lump. And while we are not prepared to say to what extent laxity in other directions springs from this error in doctrine, yet after working along side of Missouri in two of its strongholds for over four years, we have been surprised to find the amount of loose practice there is going on in her congregations. Gambling games, sale of intoxicants, theatricals, money-making socials, all conducted by the churches and for the benefit of the churches. We have been surprised and appalled, not only that these things go on openly and regularly in prominent Missouri congregations in New Orleans and Ft. Wayne, but we were surprised the more that these things had never been reported in our Church papers. The grave errors of modern Missouri and the Synodical Conference,

and such glaring looseness of practice I am well aware of and fully recognize. Yet at the same time the loose practice is condemned by the synod as such; and the errors have so far as it comes under our notice, been hardly preached from their pulpits or taught in their schools. No doubt the constant fight waged against these errors on the part of Ohio and Iowa has operated very strongly as a restraining influence against their preaching or teaching their errors to their people, and will continue so to restrain them. Looking then both on the dark and also on the bright side of the situation as it is, what advice ought we to give our members who remove to where there is a Missouri church and none of our own? After all, Missouri, grounded as it has been in the truth, and misled against its will as it has been by great leaders, and restrained as its errors are by conflict with its opponents, still produces good Lutherans. This we simply must concede. With their sound views, their conservative methods, and especially with their almost universal parochial schools, they are producing members that we as a whole may be most glad to gain for our churches, wherever they apply in an orderly manner for admission. And with almost as easy a conscience as we can receive their members, so also can we advise our members to join their congregations, where we have no church of our own. I say advisedly, with almost as easy a conscience, for we know not whereunto their error might grow. But considering the purity of their doctrine in their practical teaching in their churches thus far, we must say that by advising such members to join them, we are, humanly speaking, at this time placing them in safe hands. We suppose the case here that there is also no other Lutheran Church at the same place. We must choose between evils in such cases. If on account of Missourian error we advise the people to stand aloof, they are likely either to become a prey to the sects, or to become entirely irreligious. The predestination question has remained largely a theological one, to be dealt with by the representatives of the theological seminaries. So long as Missouri shows no more signs than

it has thus far of preaching the "glorious consolation" of its new doctrine to its people, we can without officially dismissing them, safely entrust our members to their churches under the circumstances here referred to.

For the same reason we ought not to start missions on Missouri territory where there is no prospect of building up a strong congregation of our own. To neglect fields white unto the harvest where there is no Lutheran Church, in order to start poverty-stricken congregations in opposition to Missouri, is a misapplication of mission funds, and is asking an unnecessary and unjust sacrifice of the missionaries. Thus we turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to the very great need and danger of many souls where there is no Lutheran Church, that we may supply the much smaller need and guard against the smaller danger of fewer souls in Missouri surroundings. And the position of the little opposition Church that we begin is made so extremely discouraging and uncomfortable, and the temptations to proselyting on the part of our people to strengthen themselves become so great, that after all we are not really bettering their condition.And this kind of overzeal is no doubt to some extent responsible for our present scarcity of pastors. It is different of course where we have prospect of building up a good Church, and where there is really need and room for another Lutheran Church. Here we should by no means surrender the field to Missouri. Our people have been trained to certain institutions, customs and methods of Church work, and will find themselves more or less strange in another synod. Our synod will handle the language question better than Missouri, in most cases. These are some reasons, in addition to solicitude for the preservation of pure doctrine, that should move as well as justify us to enter where Missouri is already in the field, where there is prospect for building up another good Church before a very long time. But we ought to free ourselves from that fanaticism, according to which we advise our members under no circumstances to join a Missouri Church, even where there is and likely will be none of our own.

Where Ohio and Missouri Churches are once established on the same territory, they must get along together as best they can. It makes the heart bleed to speak of this feature. Both recognizing each other as Christians, and at least to a large extent, as Lutherans, and yet unrelenting opposition betwen them. Bitterness should not be inculcated in our people, toward Missouri and yet as occasion offers and ofttimes as necessity compels, the truth and the distinction must be made clear to our people. Fidelity to truth, and very self-preservation will at times require this. We cannot dismiss our members officially to this erring body, to consent to their going away from the fuller truth. And yet with all this, we might ofttimes cultivate better relations with our Missouri neighbors than we do. Where for example an Ohio and Missouri man both recognize each other as men of honor, and are located in the same community, they ought to be able to make and observe an agreement, that they will receive no child for confirmation, no funeral, no wedding, no member from the opposing congregation without first informing the opposition that such application has been made, and giving them an opportunity to protest and give their reasons. This would guard both sides against imposition, would tend to cure members of running back and forth for every fancied offence, would lesson the itching to get people from the other side even though we must close an eye as to the character of the people. Under the present state of things we could not go so far as to agree to heed all their protests. We might find it right and our duty to receive some people in spite of protests. But if we would only agree to inform each other before such people are received and give an opportunity for some communication to be made before we receive them, it could do much good, and this without compromising our doctrinal position on either side. It would go far toward establishing at least personal confidence, and remove fruitful sources of friction, distrust and ill will.

In the Iowa Synod we deal with a friend, that has certainly stood shoulder to shoulder with us in the great pre-

destination conflict. The sound healthy Lutheran character of their doctrine and practice is, we believe, generally recognized among us. Though full fellowship and co-operation has not been established between Iowa and Ohio, many of our pastors individually practice such fellowship without objection from our body as such. And though dismissals may not be officially granted, we evidently ought to advise our members to connect themselves with an Iowa Church where we have none of our own, and do this readily, with the confidence that we are entrusting our people into safe Lutheran hands. Where Iowa is already established, we should leave the field to them without encroachment, unless it be for English work. Iowa is weak on this point. Where we cover the same field with Iowa, our relations ought to be cordial. Such an arrangement as was before proposed even for our dealings with Missouri, ought certainly to be entered into and observed with Iowa. At the same time, out of respect to members in our own synod who have scruples about entering into close fellowship with Iowa, we do well to stand toward her just as synod stands as a whole, friendly, though not in official fellowship. Iowa stands for the position that there are things taught in our confessions, which are not articles of faith, that is, they are not among those doctrines which a person must know and believe unto salvation, and it gives the liberty of leaving such teachings as open questions. From this position no doubt some unfavorable deductions may be drawn and have been drawn. For it is said, all Scripture is to be believed, and is therefore a doctrine of faith. But Dr. Fritschel says that the open questions are meant to refer to doctrines of which "there can be from their very nature no certainty of faith concerning them, as they are also not taught in Scripture as clearly and distinctly as the doctrines of faith." There may be some danger lurking in such a position, and yet we believe it is not charged at this day that any errors have crept into the body of the Iowa synod by means of this position. Concerning Chiliasm Dr. Fritschel declares that the Iowa synod rejected

every view of the Milliennium according to which there would be another way of salvation in that period than in the present.

There is substantial agreement between all portions of the Missouri and Iowa synods, respectively, and this makes it easier to deal with these bodies, than with the two which we have yet to mention: namely the General Council and the General Synod. These latter bodies are rather loose federations of a large number of synods, some of which are not and never have been in full agreement with the rest. And therefore we can by no means assume that a General Council or General Synod Church are of the same character everywhere. We must know and consider the separate synods, and even the separate congregations, for themselves.

We notice first the General Council. This body is composed of German, English and Swedish synods. The General Council unreservedly and explicitly accepts all the Confessions of our Church. In the German and Swedish portions of this body this confessional position is no doubt also carried into practice quite as well on the whole as it is among us. This is true also of some of their English churches. However, many of their English churches are quite lax in practice, especially here in Ohio, where they have a synod made up of old opponents of healthy Lutheran practice in our own synod, and who for this very reason separated from us, and went over to the Council when the latter body was organized. There being therefore no practical uniformity between the various parts of the General Council, we must know and consider each portion on its individual merits. There are many congregations in this body to whom we could safely entrust our removeing members. There are many congregations there against which we ought not to begin opposition work, and with whom we ought to be able to work harmoniously on the same field: there are again other congregations in the General Council that are so greatly lacking in Lutheran principle, that we can hardly recognize them or treat with them as Lutheran Churches. We refer here especially to the very lax position of some of

their churches with regard to secret societies, and with regard to pulpit and altar fellowship.

The General Synod is also a federation of a number of synods of which a few are more pronounced in their Lutheran character than the rest. The German Synod of Nebraska and the Wartburg Synod are German bodies, and their adherence to positive Lutheran doctrines and practice is much in advance of that of their various English synods. That there has been an awakening in this body to a much greater consciousness and appreciation of the Scriptural character and great worth of our Lutheran confessions, we admit with joy. This awakening thus far is to be seen in the position taken by some of its leading Professors, ministers and editors. The good leaven does not, however, appear to have exerted much practical influence thus far upon its congregations, so far as their practice is concerned. Nor has it moved the General body to take any higher ground with regard to its confessional status. The General Synod indeed requires all synods uniting with it "to receive and hold the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word, and of the faith of our Church as founded upon that Word." At the same time, however, when this resolution was enacted, another resolution was also enacted with it, "as an explanatory declaration upon a number of points," of which Prof. Dr. Valentine of the Gettysburg Seminary says "that it must be regarded as a part of the General Synod's doctrinal position." In this "explanatory declaration" the General Synod rejects, among other things," the Romish doctrine of the real presence or transubstantiation; auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth but that of all believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and maintains the divine obligation of the Sabbath." From this declaration it is plain that the General Synod's doctrinal position gives an uncertain sound to say the least. According to this, the real presence in the Eucharist is the same thing as transubstantiation, and both are alike rejected. By claiming that a Romish error is being rejected, the rejec-

tion of the truth is sought to be glossed over. In the same way an excuse for rejecting absolution on the part of the pastor is sought, in giving this a Romish name. And that members of the General Synod can to this day openly fight the Lutheran, Scriptural doctrine on these points, without being called to account by the Synod, shows plainly enough that there is not and never has been a full and determined acceptance of the Augsburg Confession by the General Synod. If there had been such a full acceptance, no doubt there would be no such opposition within this body to the acceptance of the remaining confessions of our Church. It is easier to give out equivocal statements concerning the earlier and briefer Confession than it would be to give the same concerning the later, much longer and much more explicit Confessions.

As unsatisfactory as is the confessional status of the General Synod, so also *is* their practice. They are unionistic through and through. They catechise in many places, but they hold series of "meetings," which they may not call revivals, but at which they also receive members without catechisation. Some of their churches do not catechise at all. In fact, it is not too much to say, that in the great majority of instances there is very little, if anything, to distinguish the General Synod churches from the more conservative of the sectarian churches, such as the Reformed and the Presbyterian. They affiliate however not only with such more conservative denominations, but also with all others. Only a short time ago a large union meeting was reported from Akron, Ohio, with sermon by the Lutheran minister in the Universalist Church. They practice open communion and not only do not oppose secret societies, but make light of those Lutherans who do oppose them, and are ready at any time to organize opposotion churches with lodge material. Their members, as experience teaches us, have so little consciousness of Lutheran doctrine or practice, that as a rule we cannot use them in our congregations, unless they will first become catechumens with us. And just as little therefore can we entrust our people who remove

from us to a General Synod community, to their churches. Where we find a good nucleus of good Lutherans in such a community, we ought if at all possible to start a mission, for they will not be properly cared for by the General Synod, any more than they would be by several of the denominations before mentioned. We refer here to the body of the General Synod. With the congregations of the German Nebraska Synod, for instance, we ought to deal differently. There are true Lutheran churches there, though they are badly affiliated in the General body. Where we jointly occupy the same ground with the General Synod, we can have but little to do with them, they are so largely foreign to the genuine Lutheran spirit and Lutheran characteristics in doctrine and practice. We can not co-operate with them, as there is virtually no common ground upon which we can stand or operate. It may seem hard to say these things at a time when this body is becoming more Lutheran, and when indeed the better element has for a number of years shown itself to be in the ascendancy. But we must continue to uphold the true standards, and protest against whatever comes short of these, and by so doing we will be giving this body the best spur to continue in its quest after the true doctrines and practices of their fathers; whereas if we and other real Lutherans were to relax our opposition to their laxity, their progress in the right direction would be likely to come to a standstill.

In stating the position of the various Lutheran Synods, and in dealing with them accordingly, we should guard against the proud "holier than thou" spirit. The heritage we have received is a gift of grace purely, a golden talent entrusted to us for humble and faithful stewardship. But while we guard against showing this spirit, just as little dare we allow ourselves to be frightened by the accusation that we are showing such a spirit, when we proclaim what we know to be the truth, and strive to practice the same. We would simply be recreant to our duty, if we did not teach and practice what we know to be the truth and our duty in these important matters. Faith indeed worketh by love, but

faith dare not be sacrificed for love's sake. On the contrary, we must continue to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

SERMON.*

REV. S. SCHILLINGER, A. M., WEST ALEXANDRIA, O.

Jer. 1. 4-8.

Beloved young Brethren about to enter the ministry and fellow hearers in Christ Jesus:—

The words of the Lord to Jeremiah: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations," are applicable to you young brethren. Though the Lord may not send you as He did Jeremiah, to Israelites (ch. 44), Egyptians (ch. 46), Philistines, Tyrians, Sidonians (ch. 47), Moabites (ch. 48), Ammonites, Edomites, Syrians, Arabians, Persians (ch. 49), Babylonians and Chaldeans (ch. 50), He nevertheless sends you to a people. In His wisdom and foreknowledge He ordained you to this office before you were born, and He has now carried you through these years of care and culture, until you are on the very eve of entering upon the duties of this office publicly. To rebel, or to refuse to obey means to fight against God. Though there may have been a time when you were in doubt about God's will, that did not change His intention and purpose pertaining to your calling. What must be settled, beyond a doubt in your minds, is that God wants you in the ministry: and this decision must be arrived at, not according to your way of thinking, but according to God's Word, and to circumstances in which the finger of God may be noticed, presenting themselves in your career. The Lord will listen just as little to your ob-

* Preached at the theological commencement of Capital University, May 18th, 1904.

jections as He did to Jeremiah, who pleaded his youthfulness.

It is true that the Lord does not call young men to-day to the prophetic or ministerial office directly, or immediately as He did the prophet; but He nevertheless calls them just as truly and certainly through the instrumentality of the Church. It is through the Church that young men are influenced to study for the ministry; the Church encourages them in their progress, and the Church calls them to the office when they have completed their studies. The Church is God's institution for the salvation of immortal souls. He has entrusted her with the means of grace, the Word and sacraments, and He wants to use you now as instruments in His hands for the application of these saving means.

The prophet made a mistake when he said: "Oh, Lord God! behold I cannot speak: for I am a child," and so would you make a mistake if you should say, that you will not enter the ministry. You have no right to say that. God gives you no such right. He has bestowed upon you the necessary gifts, and blessed you throughout your entire course, and has now stamped upon these years of work His final sanction through the call which has come to you through His dear Church. Being persuaded that it is God's will that you should enter the prophetic or ministerial office, let us consider by His grace

THE PROPHET'S DUTY.

I. *To go where the Lord sends him.*

II. *To do what the Lord commands him, and*

III. *To trust in the Lord to be with him.*

As the Savior once said to His disciples: "Go ye into all the world" (Mark 16, 15), so He says to you know: *"Go."* He said thus when under certain influences, you were persuaded to come to this institution, to equip yourselves for the ministerial office. He said thus when wrom year to year He added qualification to qualification to make you

competent and efficient. He says thus now through the calls which have come to you from different parts of the country. Realizing that it is the will of almighty God who says, "Go," your hearts should be filled with such holy awe that you would not for a moment think of saying, *no.* Oh, that it could be impressed upon the hearts of men that to refuse to go where they are sent is contending and fighting against God. And what is accomplished? Nothing good. Such conduct is absolutely futile. Did it profit Moses to say to God, "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?" Did it benefit him again to object that the children of Israel might not believe his message? (Ex. 3, 13). And when he became presumptuous and said, "Behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice" (Ex. 4, 1), did it help his cause any? And, finally, did he prevail against the Lord, when he said: "O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore, nor since thou hast spoken unto thy servant: but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue"? The Lord replied: "Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing or the blind? Have not I the Lord? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say." Ex. 4, 10-12). When Moses persisted the anger of the Lord was enkindled against him, (v. 14). It is a fearful thing to incur the wrath of God. How did the prophet fare, when in the words of our text he objected by saying: "Oh, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak: for I am a child"? . Did the Lord excuse him? No. He replied, "Say not, I am a child: for thou shalt *go* to all that I shall send thee." The most striking example of futility in opposing the Lord we have in the prophet Jonah. It shows too how such opposition incurs great danger and untold loss. The lives of the crew were endangered and the entire cargo was lost. But that is nothing compared with the loss of one soul on account of your disobedience. Jonah's example proves how absolutely impossible it is to thwart the Lord's plans. When he stubbornly refused to

obey and to go to the Ninevites, the Lord sent him through a seminary which radically changed his disposition. When he came forth from the fish's belly he was an entirely different man. When the Lord told him the second time to go to Nineveh he at once obeyed (Jonah 3, 3). These examples teach every minister of the Gospel to stand in holy awe of God's command, lest he be necessitated to undergo experiences similar to that of Jonah. Every conscientious Christian will testify that he has reasons only to regret every time he disobeys the Lord. It is not for you to say, "I am too young, I am too incompetent, it is too far from home, the people are too strange; they will not listen, they will not believe." Your esteemed teachers have decided, by the grace of God, whether you are competent, and it is your part to go where the Lord sends you, and that right willingly. When Jesus said to His disciples: "Go into all the world," they did not say: "We cannot," but they went. It sometimes occurs to ministers that the people to whom God sends them are too uncultured and unrefined, they deserve to be sent to better places; God must have made a mistake. Such reasoning is wrong. God makes no mistakes. The fault lies with them. They should carefully study God's Word, and learn a lesson from the experiences of those who were reluctant to obey, and follow the examples of those who willingly obeyed, study the example of the great apostle Paul, who at his conversion at once said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do"? (Acts 9, 6), and then willingly went wherever the Lord sent him.

It is of importance for the prophet to go where the Lord sends him, but it is of still more importance for him.

II. *To do what the Lord commands him.*

In doing the Lord's bidding he meets with many obstacles. To this the words of our text: "Be not afraid of their faces" alludes. When it speaks of being afraid it means that you will not always meet with friendly faces. The world is not friendly to the Lord's work and word. It

will have its influence over many entrusted to your care. You will meet with unfriendly faces. This all the prophets, the disciples and the Savior Himself experienced. When Moses went to deliver his kindred from Egyptian bondage he met a Pharaoh; and afterward, the children of Israel were frequently unfriendly to him. How often they murmured and rebelled; but Moses having undertaken by the grace of God, the work of the Lord, did not depart from doing the Lord's bidding in spite of their unfriendly faces. Joshua, Samuel, David, Elijah, Elisha, Micha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and all the prophets fared no better. Behold the faces the Saviour met! The scribes and Pharisees, His relentless enemies, but among God's chosen people, sought every opportunity to destroy Him. How were His disciples treated? Stephen was stoned, until kneeling down, he cried "with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep." Acts 7, 60. James was put to death. Peter was crucified with his head downward, Paul was beheaded, and all except John died the martyr's death. Time will not permit the naming of the long list of martyrs since the days of the apostles. The reformers of the sixteenth century made like experiences. Not without reason therefore did the Lord say to the prophet: "Be not afraid of their faces!" Fearful would have been the result if he had been afraid! The enemy would have been victorious, immortal souls would have been lost, and he would have been responsible. "But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take away any person among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the hands of the watchman." Ezek. 33, 6. Responsibilities are too grave to falter at unfriendly faces. Fearful would have been the result if the disciples had been afraid when they were cast into prison, deprived, beaten and put to death. Where would our dear Lutheran Church be to-day if Luther and his co-laborers had been afraid of their faces at Worms, Augsburg, Marburg and other places? Next to Christ and

His disciples, we have our great reformers to thank that the Gospel was again placed upon its candlestick and permitted to shine throughout the world. They sounded the Gospel trumpet when the land for centuries had suffered fearful spiritiual devastation at the sword of the enemy. All the sweet blessings which we now enjoy are due to the unfaltering stand which they, by the grace of God, took in spite of threats and persecutions and grim faces.

Though you may not meet with opposition of the same nature the prophets, apostles and reformers experienced, you will meet with faces not congenial to the truth. You will meet with opposition. Be not disappointed when people make wry faces at the truth! You are no better than your ancestors. "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Matt. 13, 15. This is what you must expect. But according to the Lord's instruction given to the prophet, you dare not suffer their wry faces to influence you to depart from the truth. Christ and Him crucified must be the central theme of all your preaching, whether people want to hear itor whether they do not want to hear it. Remember they must hear it or they must be damned. It is the only "name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4, 12. No matter how ugly people may twist their faces, and how much they may abuse you, the one goal you must ever keep in view, and that is to preach Christ. The Lord said: "Whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak," and the prophet obeyed the Lord. He preached His Word, line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. Isa. 28, 10. The Savior did not only tell His disciples to *go*, but to go and preach the Gospel to every creature, to all nations! It is the only power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. Rom. 1, 16. The same command is given to you. Neither dare you listen

to people who try to persuade you that something else than the Gospel would be more interesting and attractive. Something else will draw larger crowds. Shame on such preachers who will suffer themselves to be diverted from the life-giving Gospel to silly themes like: "Dynamite under the Throne," "Ideals of Manhood." "Scientific Skepticism," "Would the Virgin Mary, St. Peter, or St. Patrick attend the Catholic Church?" "Sins Covered at Pompeii," "Success in Life," "Up a Tree," "Short Beds and Narrow Coverings," "How to Choose a Wife," "Who Should Have our Sympathy in the Present War, the Japs or the Russians?" Such themes no doubt would draw large crowds, but where is the power of Gor unto salvation?

In complying with the Lord's command to speak His Word you are furthermore not to consult your own conveniences. That is a mistake too often made. Too many want to preach the Word then only when everything is convenient and sailing is perfectly smooth. At the smallest ripple, however, they begin to falter, and like Peter, sink amidst the waves. Matt. 14, 30. They are soon necessitated to quit the ministry.

Keeping the one central theme, Christ and Him crucified, steadily in view, every auxiliary must be facilitated to bring your hearers in close touch with this, their only salvation. They must be told in no uncertain sound, that they are lost and condemned creatures, but that Christ came into the world to reconcile them with their God, by fulfilling the divine law for them, and suffering and dying for their transgressions. They must be told so clearly that Christ has paid their debt of sin, and opened the portals of heaven for them, that they cannot misunderstand it. Do not make the mistake so often made, of overrating the educational standing of your people. Do not take too much for granted. It may seem a little uncharitable to under-rate people along this line, but better be a little uncharitable than to suffer their souls to be lost. Do not think they ought to know it already. Such thoughts only weaken your effort in applying the means of grace.

Many preachers clothe otherwise good and wholesome thoughts in such highfalutin language that souls must starve under their learned display. You want to apply the truth of the Gospel without a great deal of "ornate, sociological, literary, sentimental, or poetical additions." It is disgusting to hear some men try to display their learning. I have in my mind a minister who has now left our synod, who upon reading his text to his introductory sermon in a certain charge, started out by saying: "This is a very profound text; it requires one well ecquainted with Hebrew and Greek to expound this text." But he never had studied either Hebrew or Greek. He succeeded, however, in making the people believe that he was a very learned man. Such men have not the glory of God and the welfare of souls in view, but their own glory. The Savior said: "Woe unto you scribes, and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Matt. 23, 13. These words have a twofold purpose; they describe learned fools and they do it in language which cannot be misunderstood. John the Baptist is a model of plain preaching. He understood how to apply law and gospel. He told Herod that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife, Matt. 14, 4; and directing the people to their Savior, he said: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Jno. 1, 29. That can not be misunderstood. In his earnestness of spirit, Paul warns the people: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." Rom. 16, 17. That is unmistakable language.

You are not only to preach the Gospel clearly but diligently. Paul says to Timothy: "Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season; rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." 2 Tim. 4, 2. To be instant means to be about it quickly and constantly. You must never grow tired of preaching the Word constantly and

earnestly. Your earnestness will go far to win the confidence of people.

But you must not forget that there are also encouragements in the ministry. It is a sweet and comforting duty

III. *To trust in the Lord to be with you.*

The Lord does not fail to tell the prophet why he must not be afraid of their faces: "For I will be with thee to deliver thee." In these words lies the prophet's comfort, and in these words lies your comfort. If the Lord be for you who can be against you? You are certain that the Lord wants you in the ministry, and you can be just as certain that He will be with you. He is everywhere present, and therefore He is present with you wherever you may be. This is the sweet promise the Savior gave His disciples when He told them to go and preach the Gospel in all the world. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Mat. 28, 20. This promise affords you untold pleasure. The promises of the Lord are absolutely certain, therefore you can make no mistake in trusting in them. When these sweet promises are considered all troubles and afflictions vanish into nothingness.

True faith in Christ begets trust in the Lord. It is the legitimate fruit of faith. It is a delicious fruit. The Scriptures abound in expressions encouraging God's children to trust in Him. "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God. They are brought down and fallen: but we are risen and stand upright." Is. 20, 7. "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green." Jer. 17, 7. To trust in the Lord is so sweet because He who promises to be with us is so good and gracious. "The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and knoweth them that trust in him." Neh. 1, 7. We might augment passages showing how sweet and comforting it is to trust in the

Lord. Particularly is it a comfort for God's ministers, because they have made His Word a special study. The more we become acquainted with God's Word the greater is our comfort, and the more we are encouraged to trust in Him.

Remembering these sure and sweet promises that the Lord will be with you, sustain and deliver you, who will dare to say that minister of the Gospel has no pleasure? "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tiding of good things." (Rom. 10, 15; Isa. 52, 7, 8.) Some imagine that only they have pleasure who amass wealth. That is an accursed spirit of our age. It is a spirit which is playing fearful havoc and disturbing the temporal and eternal peace of "countless thousands," because it is never satisfied. "Yet there is no end of all his labors; neither is his eye satisfied with riches; neither saith he, For whom do I labor, and bereave my soul of good? This i also vanity, yet it is a sore travail." Eccl. 4, 7. Again the wise man saith: "He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase; this is also vanity. When goods increase, they are increased that eat them: and what good is there to the owners thereof, saving the beholding of them with their eyes?" Eccl. 5, 10. 11. "For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through many sorrows." 1 Tim. 6, 10. Let this suffice to show you what pleasure greed for money, which is keeping so many young men out of the ministry to-day, will eventually secure. It secures nothing but untold misery. There is, however, real pleasure in being a true child of God, and increased pleasure in being a minister of the Gospel. That pleasure results not only from trusting in the Lord with all the soul, heart, mind and strength, but also from the abundance of sacred knowledge; which assures us that for Christ's sake all our sins are forgiven, and we shall enjoy the peace of eternal life. The more you learn from the Bible, the better you will learn to know

God; the more you learn to know of God the firmer you will put your trust in Him; the more you trust in Him the better you will realize that He is a gracious God, and that He will always be with you.

It affords untold pleasure also when you realize that God is blessing your efforts. What a sweet comfort it is to realize that He is using you as instruments to rescue souls purchased with the blood of the Lamb of God! How sweet are the words of the prophet: "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Isa. 55, 10. 11. These words should recur to you with pleasure every time a soul is added to your congregations, and every time you have the assurance that a soul has fallen asleep in Jesus. That soul has been delivered from sin, from death and from the power of the devil. Oh, what comfort this affords the earnest minister of the Gospel!

Remember the Lord says that He will be with the prophet to deliver him from all his enemies. So He will deliver you and all His children, who trust and believe in Christ their Savior to the end.

May God be with you now, and through your entire ministerial career, as He was with the prophet, and for Christ's sake bless the work of your hands. Amen.

NOTES AND NEWS.

I. PROTESTANT PROGRESS IN AUSTRIA.

Complete statistics of the "Away from Rome" movement in Austria for the past year show that the total number of converts from the Catholic to the Protestant church in 1903 was 4,056, which is something less than it had been for the preceding five years. On the other hand, the Catholics gained from the Protestants 937, making a net increase for the latter of 3,119. The counter agitation of the Catholic authorities are greater than ever, especially through "Bonifacius" societies, which aim to work chiefly in Protestant centers. The state, too, is ever ready to work in the interests of the Catholic party. Only lately have the political authorities deprived Pastor Klein, of Turn, who had for four years been successfully engaged in this work and was at the point of dedicating a fine church, of his rights as a Protestant pastor in Austria. Friends of the cause are convinced that the progress of the of the cause will be steady and regular. The movement has become more evangelical and spiritual, being entirely divorced from the political and the national characteristics that marked its beginnings. During the past four years the total increase to the Protestant cause through this movement has been 22,-264, namely: in 1899 it was 5,372, in 1900 it was 3,094, in 1901 it was 5,469, in 1902 it was 3,472, in 1903 it was 3,119.

II. FOREIGN STUDENTS IN GERMANY.

Germany continues to attract students from foreign lands in increased proportions, and the enrollment of a university like Berlin reads like a catalogue of nations. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* reports that during the present winter term the total number of full or unmatriculated students in the universities of Germany is 37,881, and of these

3,093, or 8.2 per cent, are foreigners, the greatest number absolutely and relatively ever reported. The average during the last few years was only about seven per cent. Of these foreigners, 739 are students of philosophy, philology and history; 722, of medicine; 651 of mathematics and natural sciences; 366 of jurisprudence; 231 of political science and forestry; 178, of agriculture; 135 of Protestant theology; 32 of Catholic theology; 26 of dentistry; 13, of pharmacy; 2,620 come from non-German countries of Europe, and 473 from non-European lands. Russia sends the largest contingent, viz., 986, followed with Austro-Hungary with 588; Switzerland, with 318; England, with 162; Bulgaria, with 73; Roumania, with 69; France, with 64; Greece, with 59; Servia, with 55; the Netherlands, with 49; Turkey, with 41; Italy, with 43; Luxemburg, with 33; Sweden and Norway, with 33; Belgium, with 14; Spain, with 13; Denmark, with 12; Portugal, with 4; Montenegro, with 2, and Lichtenstein, with 1. Of the other foreigners, 319 came from America; 113 from Asia; 19 from Africa, and 12 from Australia. The Americans are nearly all from the United States and the Asiatics from Japan. This list includes only the unmatriculated students and takes no account of the foreign element in the twelve thousand others who are entitled to university allowance nor of the foreigners in the Technological Institutes, which now stand on an equality with the Universities. These would probably double the list of Germany's foreign "academic citizens."

III. ORTHODOX CHURCH UNION.

Joachim III, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Christians in Turkey in conjunction with the Synod of Constantinople, had some time ago addressed a letter to the Russian Synod appealing for a union of the two branches of the orthodox church in their work. In the answer given by the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg, it is declared that such a union can be effected only through an œcumenical council, but

that under present political conditions it would be impossible to call such a convention; hence the church could do nothing at present but to pray for the consummation of this project. It is further stated that over against the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches, the Orthodox church has never ceased to pray that they may see the error of their way, but that the aggressiveness and proselyting tendencies of these churches have awakened the conviction that all possibilities of a union with them are excluded. The Russian synod declares that it purposes to confine its activity to gaining the adherents of other confessions within the Russian Empire for the orthodox fold, especially does it purpose to reunite the Armenian church with the orthodox. On this subject the message is perfectly clear, and this program explains the policy of the government in assuming control of the Aremnian church moneys some months ago. There evidently was method in that madness.

IV. INDEPENDENT CATHOLIC SCHOLARSHIP.

That fair-minded scholars of the Roman Catholic communion keenly feel the fact that the secular learning of that church is sadly out of touch and tone with the best scholarship of the day is shown again and again, especially in Germany, where in the Universities, in public life and thought, and in literature, the representatives of the two churches must rub up against each other more than is done in other countries. The Schell episode has passed into history and the Fifth International Convention of Catholic Savants, held in Munich, has openly avowed its subjection to the authorities. But that addresses evincing considerable liberty of thought were delivered at this convention is evident from the recently published Report of this convention issued by Herder, of Freiberg, in which the papers evincing this spirit are published *in extenso,* which were not even given in extract in such leading Catholic papers as the Berlin *Germania* and the Cologne *Volkszeitung.* The

most noteworthy of these addresses was doubtless that of Dr. Hermann Grisor, rather remarkably a noteworthy representation of the famous Jesuit faculty at Innsbruck. His subject was the relation of Catholic scholarship to critical historical research, in which he openly acknowledged that in the couse of centuries, owing to the lack of critical historical spirit in the Catholic church, many unfounded traditions, stories of miracles and myths in reference to the doings of God and to relics had found general acceptance in the Church. He added:

"The principal charge which we would make against the hyper-conservatism in this regard is that, that it did not watch carefully the historical growth of erroneous opinions which have come down from earilier ages and grew in size with the years."

After reviewing the origin and development of such erroneous opinions and showing that these cannot stand the test of careful examination, Grisor demands that the result of historical criticism should with proper care and concern, be made known to the people. He well understands what this means, as he adds:

"Many a word has to-day been uttered which is not intended for the people in general and which should not be printed by the public press, but only for the Congress of Catholic savants. I accordingly ask the reporters of the press to publish only that which ought to be given to the average reader. Should they do otherwise, they would not further the change in the conviction of the people at large, but would hinder it." The speaker then urged that the authorities of the Church themselves take in hand the work of enlightening the average Catholic on these subjects, and should do so in harmony with the representatives of modern learning. Grisor thinks that if Galileo had sought feeling with the church authorities when he announced his great discoveries, probably the sacred congregation would not have made its fatal decision in the case. It is the *Congregatio Rituum* which should take charge of this work and this body should particularly be active in preventing

the circulation of unripe works, pilgrimage literature, ascetic works, etc., the authors of which do not even know the elements and A B C of history or criticism.

Not all Catholic scholars are, however, willing to continue their adherence to the Church that they think frowns on legitimate scientific researches. The latest representation of this class is the Abbe Renard, the well-known Belgian Jesuit and Professor of history, and a man whose scholarship has received international recognition, he having received the doctor's degree from Edinburg, Bolgna and Dublin. He has recently severed his connection with the Church with these words:

"The spirit of a new life is transforming the spirits of men. Ideas which have held the mastery for centuries over the conscience are giving way to other and more correct conceptions. Science is making wonderful strides If my step does not meet with your approval, at any rate give your respect to the man who did not hesitate to cease being an unbelieving priest in order to be an upright man." Quite naturally the step taken by Renard has called forth the most enthusiastic welcome on the part of the liberal press, but also the sharp criticism of the Church papers. The latter make free use of such terms as "roman sénile," "fon," and others.

V. SOME BIBLE FINDS.

Professor von Soden, of the Berlin University, while on the hunt for New Testament manuscripts in the East about two years ago was fortunate enough to find in the *Kubbet* or inner closed chamber of the chief mosque of Damascus a whole mass of documents, which, at the solicitation of the German Emperor, were entrusted to the Berlin Museum. Von Soden, with the co-operation of Bruno Violet, who has devoted a full year to these manuscripts, has now made a report of his findings to the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, the results being presented by Professor Harnack. The collection includes among other treasures the following documents: 1) Latin liturgical

works, with musical notes, from the 10th to 12th centuries, also Latin letters of King Baldwin of Jerusalem and an old French hymn of 38 verses; 2) A large collection of Hebrew works, profane and religious, synogogal literature and fragments of the Scriptures; 3) Some most valuable Samaritan texts, including a calendar and Pentateuch fragments; 4) Large fragments of the Armenian language, consisting of 20 Psalms, and large portions of Matthew, and parts of the church fathers; 5) A Georgian fragment not yet deciphered; (6) Several Egyptian Coptic writings; 7) In largest number Syriac literature is represented, some of these works being palimsests with Arabic underwriting, among them a Commentary by Theodore of Mopsuestia; 8) Greek Ecclesiastical writings in Biblical fragments, including portions of Homer, fragments of Septuagint, New Testament extracts, all in majuscule writing, among these also a selection from John's Gospel; 9) The most valuable portion of the collection is a fragment in Palestinian-Aramaic language and writing taken from the Old Testament and the gospels as also unica from Paul's Epistles. Jews, Samaritans, Christians and Moslems have all contributed to the contents of this collection.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. AUGUST, 1904. No. 4.

BACCALAUREATE SERMON.*

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD PFEIFFER.

2 Tim. 3, 17.

Dear brethren, friends and patrons of Capital University, honored instructors and students, and members of the class of 1904, in whose special honor we are assembled here to-night, and to whom, in particular, my words will be addressed:

The commencement season in an educational institution, though it recurs annually and is marked by certain fixed features that give it a familiar appearance, is full of significance to the school and especially to the graduating class. It marks both a close and a beginning, — the close of one course, the beginning of another. To those who are the chief exponents of the festivities it is therefore a good halting station, — to rest, and reflect, and review their bearings. Has your course hitherto been lacking in definite purpose, in concentration, in determination? And is your outlook equally aimless? Have you been just drifting along, and are you now something like a cork upon the waters of life, liable, from sheer inertia, to drift hither or thither, back into the seminary, perchance, and into the holy office of the ministry, or elsewhere with equal ease, as wind and tide and extraneous forces generally may carry you? I trust that such an aimless character is not yours, for I fear you would be likely to make the experience of those who in the words of a certain archbishop "aim at nothing, and hit it."

*Published by request of the Alumni Association of Capital University.

But important as it is to have a definite aim in view, much depends on the character and quality of one's aim. This world, with its glory and glitter, its stores of hidden wealth, its fields to be explored, its woes and needs, offers a wide range of possible goals for the soul's ambition and aspiration. There are aims high and low, noble and debased. You may aim at the stars, or you may aim at the ground. And the character of your achievement will be in accordance with the altitude and the purity of your aim. — Can there be a higher, nobler aim in life than that set before us in our text? "That the man of God may be perfect," etc. This word was addressed to Timothy and has reference first of all to those who are or are to be ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, ambassadors of the Most High, who, as dying men are to proclaim to a dying world Him who is the resurrection and the life, able to save to the uttermost. But this word of truth, so full of inspiration for ministers, applies in a measure to all Christians and presents the most exalted standard for human endeavor in any and every honorable sphere of life. It is permissible, therefore, to make an application of the text to the present occasion, and to you in particular, my young friends, on this the eve of your graduation. You, too, I trust, are men of God in a very real sense, disciples and followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, children of God and heirs of glory by faith in His blessed name. And then I am sure that this word of the inspired apostle, this — what Smiles calls "glorified ideal of a possible human life" will appeal to you not merely from an ethical and humanitarian point of view, but from the standpoint of the inspired Word of truth, the standpoint of God and godliness.

In this light I would ask you to consider

THE AIM AND END OF YOUR SCHOLASTIC CAREER.

In accordance with the two members of our text, it is, tersely expressed, (I) *Personal Completeness* (II) *Unto Efficient Service.*

I. *Personal Completeness.*

What does it mean and imply? "That the man of God may be perfect." The R. V. and A. R. V. translate: "That the man of God may be complete." The 20th C. N. T.: "That a godlike man may be perfect himself." Luther: "Dass ein Mensch Gottes sei vollkommen." — Surely, no one will be disposed to challenge the ideal character of "completeness," "perfection," as a goal, an aim for character and conduct. But is it not too ideal? Is it not too high? Is it not impracticable, because unattainable? "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." All our knowing and doing, our willing and achieving, is and remains fragmentary, incomplete, imperfect. And, as Ruskin reminds us, when in any art the highest point of perfection has been reached, there begins an era of decadence and decline. And yet God Himself sets before us this standard as goal, and that, perfection in the very highest sense, — moral and spiritual perfection, a condition of sinlessness and holiness equal to God Himself. He does it by precept and by example. Christ, the Teacher of teachers, closes one part of His sermon on the mount with the startling injunction: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." And Christ Himself, in His spotless character and life, walks before us, an example and a pattern of the perfect man, and bids us follow Him. Even this absolute perfection and sinlessness, therefore, though it is unattainable in this world, as long as we sojourn in the flesh, wherein dwelleth no good thing, is still a proper goal to keep in view, and toward it the earnest believer is ever striving, ever "reaching forth unto those things which are before," with many slips and faults and failures still pressing "toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," till by His grace and merits we attain unto the perfection of the saints in glory.

But it is not perfection in this highest sense which I have in mind and which I wish to urge as a goal of scholastic endeavor. The term used in our text has, I think, a particular object in view. It does not look primarily to ultimate perfection in the kingdom of glory, but has refer-

ence to earthly relations, to preparation for work, with the sense of "fitting," "adapted," "having special aptitude for given uses." And this is the particular view and application which I wish to make of it for our present purpose. The aim and end of an educational course, such as you have completed, is the development of complete and well rounded manhood, and that in every direction in which man is capable of being developed, physically, intellectually, morally and spiritually. We must have in view the purpose of the old Latin proverb: "Mens sana in corpore sano." And far beyond the conception of the classic teachers of antiquity and the highest ideals of Greek and Roman culture, the aim is not fully attained in the training of brain and body, of the mental and the physical in man, which may issue in the development of keen thinkers, shrewd speculators, cunning tricksters and arch fiends, ambitious politicians, astute statesmen, and even more or less broad-minded and large-hearted philanthropists. The aim, from a Christian point of view contemplates the development not merely of men of the world, but of men of God, men whose spiritual nature has not only been touched, but raised into sufficient prominence to mold and control and direct the training of mind and body. Ephraim of old, whose character is described as that of "a cake not turned," that is, baked to a crust on the one side and dough on the other, is a sample product of poor and faulty education. Personal completeness, from an educational standpoint, avoids the undue and abnormal development of any part of man's being at the expense and loss of another and implies his adequate and harmonious development in body, mind and spirit. In body, because as disembodied spirits there is no room or work for us in this world; in mind, because without it man sinks to the level of the irrational brute; in soul and spirit, because man, created of God and in God's image, is made unto God, and his soul is restless ever until it find rest in God.

Has your school work hitherto tended in this direction? In order to answer this question fairly and satisfactorily two factors must be considered, the school and you yourselves.

You have a right to question your alma mater to-night and ask whether she has been a wise and faithful mother unto you, whether she has afforded you those opportunities which you needed, whether she has thrown about you those influences which were calculated to enable you to reach the coveted goal. If you put the question to me, my answer is: I believe with all my heart that, making due allowance for her limitations and imperfections, she has. It is not my purpose to enter upon a detailed analysis of the situation, but there is a conviction which I have often revolved in mind and which seeks expression from my lips to-night, and that is that our institution hos, under God's gracious blessing, been making progress, that it is more capable of doing efficient work and fulfilling its destiny to-day than it was twenty years ago, when some of us who are bearing burdens now were light hearted boys and fault finding students. When we consider its equipment, its teaching force, its spirit and tone, its aims and ideals, I believe we have every reason to thank God and take courage. For we have not reached a stage of self-complacent satisfaction with our present attainments, of resting upon the laurels we may have won, of seeking refuge behind past achievements. Our faces are to the front and our minds bent upon the solution of problems that are before. We have been making substantial progress in certain directions, and we are hopeful of making still further improvement. To give a single tangible illustration of improved equipment along physical and intellectual lines I would point you to the fact that the contemplated gymnasium and auditorium has become more than an idle dream and fond desire. It has substantial backing, — not only the determined and persevering leadership of our progressive president, but the promises and pledges of many earnest friends and patrons of the school, and already it is looming up on the horizon with the promise of materializing in the not too distant future. And this, I take it, is an illustration of the spirit and tenor of our present work, the spirit that imbues every teacher and asserts itself in every class room, the spirit of conservative push and progress, of

making the most of our opportunities and outfit, of studying improved methods and laboring toward the highest educational ideals.

But at this point we are confronted by the comparative poverty and dearth of our school in contrast with the wealth and resources of many other colleges in the sphere of mechanical appliances, libraries, scientific apparatus, and the like. And we grant that they have a decided advantage on this score. Along certain lines, not to be undervalued, they have a physical and intellectual equipment such as we have not and can never hope to have. But along with these advantages the average elaborately equipped college and university has certain elements of grave danger and weakness. And the gravest point of danger and weakness lies in their tendency to overestimate and unduly to emphasize the physical and intellectual, and to undervalue and distort the spiritual element in the education and development of complete manhood. When, for example, the popular theory of evolution, which within the life of our present generation has become so prevalent and all-pervading, takes possession of every science, moral and mental and even religious as well as physical; when such a hpothesis, which reduces all growth and development to natural forces and, consistently carried out, eliminates divine Providence and rules out the creative and all-directing hand of God from human affairs, molds the textbooks, controls the teaching and fills the halls of learning with a materialistic atmosphere; when this spirit of higher criticism, this highly prized naturalistic method of historical development and investigation, which has fairly become a fad and hobby, an educational craze in our day, controls the study of all literature, including the Holy Scriptures, and dominates not only the sciences which deal with the facts and phenomena of nature and matter, but those also which investigate the processes of mind and soul; and when in this latter sphere, the most subtle and sacred part of man, methods of study are pursued, and mechanical apparatus applied, and deductions made and theories advanced that practically reduce the mind and soul to the level of

matter in origin, in action and in destiny; do such and similar methods of teaching, training and discipline tend toward perfection? Can such educational proceses develop personal completeness? Do they tend to spread the truth and to glorify God?

We, on our part, are content to go on in our humble way, with smaller material equipment, but with more faith in God, doing what we can to fulfill our mission as a Christian school, willing to acquire and apply the most approved educational methods, but refusing to depart from the standard of God's revealed truth, seeing that the Word of God is the beginning of wisdom, and the entrance of His Word giveth light and understanding. In this spirit and according to these sanctified methods, you, my young brethren, have been taught. This goal, a complete Christian manhood, has been held before you as the aim and end of your scholastic career. — Have you, on your part, profited by our work, as you should? Question your own souls to-night upon the measure of your own fidelity. And that not with any expectation or hope of repairing the past, but as a safeguard against the wasting opportunities in the future. For your course of education is not ended with your graduation, even if you should not return to school at the opening term next fall. But, leaving this personal question with you for further reflction I am free to aver that whatever shortcomings and weaknesses have attached to the work, from the one cause or from the other, your course hitherto has really and truly tended in the direction of personal completeness.

Have you the disposition, the inclination, to continue in this direction? Are you determined to progress and by God's grace to succeed in the noble struggle which you have begun, the race toward perfection? If not, your course has been a comparative failure. For you will not remain what you are now. You know the familiar adage: "Qui non proficit, deficit." I don't know how you feel with reference to the present stock of your acquisitions, but I trust that, of all things, you are not inflated with a sense of satisfaction in view of the vastness of your present attainments. The

great philosopher and scientist Newton confessed that he felt himself but as a child playing by the seashore, while the immense ocean of truth lay all unexplored before him. It is the common experience of all true scholars, that the further they advance in this or that sphere of investigation the further the goal of mastery in the sphere seems to be removed. It is a long and weary way that leads to the goal. Will you keep on climbing and struggling and plodding? It has been our aim, the aim of all your teachers, the aim of your scholastic career, to cultivate and foster within you this disposition to continue in well-doing, to add still further to your accumulated store, to go on from strength to strength, to persevere unto the end, to strive without ceasing toward the full realization of personal completeness, — but personal completeness always

II. UNTO EFFICIENT SERVICE.

"That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished" etc. — "furnished completely unto every good work." The same word that in the first clause expresses personal completeness is repeated in the second clause in amplified form and in relation to its sphere of application — unto every good work. That is significant and suggestive.

Knowledge, ability, attainments and personal accomplishments are not ends in themselves. They are, indeed, sources of personal satisfaction and enjoyment, and properly so. Why should not the student enjoy to the fullest possible extent the rich treasures of thought and wisdom, the beautiful forms as well as the noble characters, upon which his soul may feast in literature, in history, in science and philosophy? But he may not and must not rest in such enjoyment and consider it the end of his work. It only betrays his scholarly tastes and instincts, if his study is to him a very attractive place. But he must treat it not as a refuge for selfish enjoyment and contemplative retirement, not as a monastic retreat, however pure its atmosphere, but as a workshop, as an armory, a place of preparation for the real work of life. As the poet has said:

"We should rest, not for dreams, but for fresher power,
To be and to do."

This view of personal completeness with a practical aim, with reference to work for mankind, is not in itself specifically Christian, nor is it limited to particular nations. Philanthropic enterprise as a worthy object of human endeavor has entered into the philosophies of all those whom the world has regarded as great teachers and leaders of nations. Confucius taught his disciples to believe that conduct is three-quarters of life. He inculcated magnanimity and other virtues that are expressive of benevolent sentiment, and helpful service toward others. To this oriental pagan sage are ascribed sentences like these:

"Never halt nor languor know,
To the Perfect would'st thou go,
Let thy reach with breadth extend
Till the world it comprehend."

It is a familiar story to you how patriotism and civil virtues flourished in the palmy days of Greece and Rome, when to dare and die for his country was the highest ambition of the Spartan youth, and to be a Roman was greater than a king. In one of the ancient lays, describing the valor and heroic defense of Horatius, the captain of the gate, it is said

"The Romans were like brothers
In the brave days of old."

Shall our sentiments be less philanthropic and patriotic, shall our ideals be lower than those of pagan sages and heathen nations who knew not God? If we would be faithful to our trust, they must be higher, according to our Lord's principle of stewardship, "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required."

The aim and end of our completeness, as men of God, of our preparation and equipment for our life work, is not

merely service rendered to our fellowmen in this or that honorable and useful sphere, but service which is distinctively and characteristically Christian. It makes a world of difference whether a work or act is performed as an act of worldly philanthropy and natural benevolence and civic virtue, or whether it is performed as the product of the trinity of Christian virtues, faith, hope and love. While the works, on the one hand and on the other, may have the same outward appearance, and while casual observers may see little if any difference between them, they are radically and essentially different, and that because of the radically different attitude and relation of the doer, in the one case and in the other, to God. They are different in source and origin, in motive and manner, in spirit and aim. This distinctive Christian element is not eliminated from the work of a Christian college, even though the subjects of study which constitute its curriculum are in large part the same as those in other colleges that make no prentensions of being Christian. Just as little is the Christian element, as a vital force, to be eliminated from the product of Christian schools. But in proportion as the Spirit of Christ, true Christianity, prevails and is potent in the work of the school, in the same proportion may we expect it to assert its power in the character and work of those who have enjoyed its advantages.

For these reasons we look to you, young men, graduates of Capital Uuniversity, in the strength of the intellectual, moral and spiritual equipment and training which you have received, to render unto God and to your fellowmen *efficient and faithful Christian service.* I am not now particularly concerned about the special sphere in which you shall apply your talents and render such service, nor is it my purpose to enter into the subject at any length. The rendering of Christian service does not imply that you must, under all considerations, enter the Christian ministry, and that, if you do not, you are necessarily wrapping your talents in a napkin. Would to God that the holy ministry of the Word were the deliberate, intelligent and conscientious choice of

every one of you. For I am not only personally in love with the ministry, but I am fully persuaded that it is the highest and noblest office to which mortal man can aspire. And the need of men for the holy office is just now so great, the call for recruits so loud and urgent. Would that you and many others might hear and heed the call! But intense, nay, agonizing, as the situation is from this point of view, I feel that a word of caution is in place. Consider well, earnestly and prayerfully, the Church's call for ministers, which is the Lord's call, and whether He is not calling *you* to the holy office. But I deplore a disposition simply to drift back into the seminary and into the ministry without due consideration and without earnestness and ardor of purpose. We will all welcome you back in the fall, if in the fear of the Lord you decide to prepare for the ministry, and we bid you buckle down to more assiduous and more prayerful study than you have ever done before. But if, with little thought and conscious effort, you were to do, as some have done, before you, return and drift on simply because that seems to be the line of least resistance and requires the least effort, it is doubtful whether you could expect the Lord's blessing upon your work.

Whatever you decide to do, do it in the fear of the Lord and as unto the Lord, in order to accomplish His holy will and glorify Him. Do not forget that your complete equipment is "unto every good work." In whatever station or position or relation the Lord, in His providence, may place you, there apply your talents to the tasks assigned, glad to be of some service, as Christian men, in wielding such influences as shall advance the interests of God's kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and so promote the true welfare of mankind. "Unto every good work." Oh that your life, your force, your voice and vote, your character and conduct, may always be on the side of the good as against the evil, the side of right as against wrong, the side of truth as against falsehood and error. Such a life is worth living. It is the worthy product of

Christian education. It will reflect honor upon the institution that has helped to mold and equip it. It leads through conflict and warfare to victory. Its end is peace.

And the source of this power? That is indicated by the connection in which our text stands. "All Scripture is given," etc. The purpose of Holy Scripture, the Word of revelation, given by inspiration of God, is to produce such lives, to endue them with power from on high, to equip them for service and to crown them with success. It is what our Savior prayed for on the eve of His sacrificial death: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth."

"Serve God and be cheerful. Live nobly,
Do right and do good. Make the best
Of the gifts and the work put before you,
And to God, without fear, leave the rest."

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

PROFESSOR TH. MEES, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

II.

In my previous article the purpose was to set forth as convincingly as possible the lines, along which religious instruction can most efficiently be pursued with children, in order that a conscious knowledge and adequate comprehension of the saving truth may be attained by them. I realize perfectly, that the scheme implies a departure from beaten paths, which have become more or less traditional in Sunday School work, probably in a measure due to persistent examples offered by the evolution of this institution in the churches of our land. On the other hand it is a fact, that the insufficiency of the means employed is being recognized by the staunchest defenders of the Sunday School, and efforts to improve the system and to increase its usefulness are put forth by men representative of all shades of religious convictions.

If the principles evolved were at all experimental and had not the warrant of successful applictaion in school work, I might well hesitate to continue the elaboration of a "pedagogical theory" in the face of seeming conservatism, which is prone to interpret everything new to it as a revolt against historically recognized tradition, and as iconoclastic imprudence; the fact that running after false gods has become a habit, does not argue that the establishment of new, or rather old but forgotten, principles, implies idolatrous tendencies. In placing the Bible histories in the front rank for the inculcation of the blessed truth, as most naturally adapted to the immature childmind, we but follow the example of the Great Teacher, who in numberless instances sought to bring home his doctrines in the form of the story, and the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews makes the history of Israel and the patriarchs the background of all his teaching. If any one error of method stands self-confessed it is this, that accumulated material in memory only is proof of real knowledge, and that glib recitation of abstract formulæ and technical terms means a comprehension of the vital truths embodied therein.

If an apology for the rather technical introduction to the completed scheme for the organization and method of instruction in the Sunday School, as it is purposed to present in this discussion, be required, it may be found in the statement, that before we can hope to do the very best for our children, we must become students of the nature and development of the childmind; we must know something of the soullife of the child; we must seek to discover the avenues by which that soullife can most effectively be reached; we must understand the influence of educational means upon the formation and direction of the powers of the soul, that they may be fashioned after the plan of the teacher; in short, we are required to identify ourselves in our intercourse with children with their interests, their capacities, their mode of thinking, their possibilities and their limitations. It will not be difficult then to discover the proper means of education. And as the duty of *con-*

struction of the Sunday School belongs immediately to the pastor, it is not presuming too much, that a technical clearing of the atmosphere will be welcomed by scientifically trained minds.

The Sunday School, in order to meet its highest ideal as a *divine service for our children,* in which instruction in doctrine and application of the truths learned to life are the objects to be attained, should embody in essence the same features which characterize the regular congregational service, the form of worship only undergoing such modifications as the great variety of children and their immature minds would require. It were desirable, that a uniform liturgy for all our Sunday Schools should be composed exhibiting all elements of Christian worship in an orderly and systematic form, and arranged so as to enlist the understanding and interest of the children in all its details. Responses, songs and prayers should at once unite all present in a common service and create an atmosphere of sanctity which too often is obscured by a certain perfunctory poceeding partaking of the character of ordinary "school opening." Thus the children would from the first moment be made to feel, that they are there to praise the Lord and to serve Him with hearts and voices.

This feature, important as it seems to me, is merely suggested here and, in the absence of fixed forms, the pastor can readily devise a brief liturgical opening-form to suit the varying conditions in his charge. The principal element of the service, the instructive and edifying sermon, would naturally assume the *catechetical* form as especially suitable for children. Every teacher of experience is aware of the difficulty of engaging the fixed attention of children to any lengthy discourse even on subjects which deal with matter generally interesting to them. A very few minutes will suffice to exhaust this interest, for the simple reason that other interests which have a powerful grasp on the child's mind must for the time be displaced. As soon as these engaging interests are again in the ascent, no effort of the teacher can restore that mental attitude with which the child must

approach a subject in order that a lasting impression may result. It is therefore of the highest importance to enlist the cooperation of the child and cause the simple receptivity to be transformed into selfactivity at the hand of skillful questioning. This is accomplished by a constant succession of presentation and catechisation, in such a manner, that something new, instinctively felt by the child and partly anticipated by the teacher, calls forth a desire for further instruction and satisfaction. A common fault of inexperienced teachers is just this temptation to *talk truths* into the child with the result, that the children soon weary of the monotony of the exercise and much valuable time and opportunity is lost. A noted pedagogue has aptly described this method as "too much preaching and too little *teaching.*" A second and fatal fault is to create the impression in the child that it is required to recite a lesson after the manner of common school work. As soon as it has creditably answered a question on a subject which it is supposed to have studied during the week and which it may have faithfully memorized, all further interest in the matter begins to flag till its "*turn*" comes again. The child must await the hour of Sunday School with a feeling of expectation and curiosity, if I may say so, knowing that it has been promised to learn something, for which a desire has been stimulated. This is the great secret of creating interest, and if properly presented, an alertness of mind will be manifested in the child which bespeaks an undivided attention.

From the statement above, that the catechization must be for the children, what the sermon is for the adults, the inference will at once follow, that the subject matter to be treated must be *one and the same for the whole school.* The wisdom or even practicability of this requirement may be questioned by many. It will be argued, that with the great difference among the children in age and proficiency, especially in large schools, the scheme presents insurmountable difficulties, both as to execution and as to adequate results to be obtained. The objection further will be noted, that this method destroys the very character of the Sunday

school by substituting the "ancient and antiquated Christenlehre" for the more modern class-method in vogue. And finally the assertion will be made that thus the assistance and labor of a body of teachers from the laity will be entirely eliminated. When fully understood, I trust all these seeming difficulties will vanish.

The natural organizer, superintendent and teacher of the Sunday School is the *pastor*. Whatever other forces may be utilized in the practical execution of its purposes, they can only be assistants in the various functions delegated to them. All threads of the complicated mechanism must be gathered in the hands of the spiritual teacher of the congregation and must be controlled by him subject to the voice of the whole congregation. It is a baneful tendency which has not infrequently manifested itself, to divorce the Sunday school from the congregation to an extent, that it has assumed the nature of an organization outside of the congregation, with peculiar aims and purposes having little in common with the interests of the congregation. Thus the functions of the lay superintendent have often become augmented beyond their legitimate scope, and the pastor may be a welcome guest or visitor, but his authoritative position as shepherd of the flock is manifestly displaced. The Sunday school must remain an integral part of the whole church organism, under its immediate supervision and under personal direction of the divinely appointed pastor, who therefore is the only recognized spiritual teacher of the lambs of the flock. If this relation be disturbed, the Sunday school becomes, in fact, a private school with the false luster of a churchly institution.

If it be claimed, that *one* teacher cannot profitably instruct so diversified a body of children at one time, the fact may be pointed out, that this very successful method is constantly employed in so-called "mixed" parochial schools, where one teacher has under his care children from six to thirteen years of age, and it has been eminently blessed in its results in the time-honored and unfortunately discarded "Christenlehre." It is all a question of *how to do it!* To

the charge that some of the features of the "Christenlehre" enter into the scheme, I cheerfully plead guilty, without conceding the point, that the best characteristics of the Sunday school are eliminated. I would retain the excellencies of both systems. And this assertion will meet the third objection, that no work remains for a body of teachers recruited from the lay membership of the congregation. They indeed become a necessary body of assistants to the pastor with certain functions well within their ability and important enough to tax their fullest enthusiasm and application. The writer has had the blessed privilege to conduct "Christenlehre" for fifteen years, and has never had cause to complain of lack of interest in a mixed class embracing children from the sixth year to confirmed members of two and three years, including gray-haired men and women, who were prepared to answer questions of more serious import. *The solution of the problem lay in making Bible histories the basis of instruction.*

Proceeding from this position as outlined above, the question naturally suggests itself: How can the method be made to work out practically, and what will be the duties of the lay teachers in class work? I believe that the following plan of organization will solve the problem and put Sunday schools on a useful basis. Eliminating "infant classes" from the scheme, the children of a Sunday school will naturally fall into three great divisions, which for convenience we may call *primary, intermediate,* and *advanced;* the first embracing children of six and seven years; the second, from eight to eleven, the third, from twelve to fourteen years of age. Each division is subdivided into as many *parallel classes,* as the number of children requires, a class numbering from eight to ten individuals, if at all possible. The same lesson for all classes forms the subject of instruction, whose preparation is directed by the class teacher, in a manner adapted to the capacity of the children in the three great divisions.

In the *primary classes* the teacher will be required to

relate the *facts* of the history in a childlike and simple manner, taking a small section at a time as suggested by the text, and at once rehearsing it without any comment other than required to bring the simple facts to the knowledge of the children. In addition a short Bible verse or catechism text, previously selected with a view to fix a spiritual or ethical truth, that will be developed later by the pastor, to be taught by word of mouth to these little ones by the teacher, care being taken that every child can correctly repeat them. This requires skill of no mean order and will tax the best efforts of a teacher during the week before to practice it. On the other hand it appeals with great force to the young women, who as a rule have charge of such classes, is well within their ability and brings them in exceptionally close touch with each child. If well narrated, such a story becomes a living picture in the child's soul. This exercise is designed to occupy about twenty minutes.

The classes of the *second division* will be furnished with a Bible history book, from which the same history will be read, also in sections after the manner of the first division, and repeated in a more detailed manner, but with strict adherence to the facts only. In like manner a previously selected Bible verse or catechism text will be fixed in memory by individual recitation. If possible, a hymnbook verse can be added, to be learned by the pupil during the week.

For the classes of the *third division* an extensive Bible history book will be used, the *same* lesson to be read and discussed in the same manner, but yet more fully and comprehensively, reference being made to striking geographical, ethnological and other important matter brought into view by the history itself. Bible verses and catechism text selected with the same view as shown above and studied during the week, will be rehearsed. The difficulties which may arise for teachers in this division will be met by the instruction of the pastor in his "teachers' meetings," where every teacher should be provided with a note-book in which to take down the salient facts under discussion. In this manner the teacher's activity will be enlisted and a fine com-

pendium for future use will be compiled. After a two years' course, the arduous duty of instructing the teachers will be reduced to a minimum.

All this preparatory work is to be accomplished in about twenty or twenty-five minutes, when the children of the whole school will be ready to take part in the further instruction at the hands of the pastor, well equipped with all material and eager to learn something new in connection with what they already know. This will again consume about twenty minutes and thus twenty minutes of the hour will be at the superintendent's disposal to discharge such other duties as are concomitant with Sunday school work. Again the principle is observed, to give children little at a time, but that little in varied forms to a *definite aim.*

What "helps" would this scheme require? First, a well constructed *Primary Bible History,* carefully planned and arranged, as will appear later, embracing fifty Old Testament and fifty New Testament stories designed to be completed in two years by the *second division.* Our larger history would well serve for the *third division,* and our catechism and hymnbook supplying all remaining matter. Our faithful teachers would be "living helps" for the little ones. Thus *three* reviews of the same matter, but judiciously *graded,* will be insured covering a course of from six to eight years including the memorizing of about one hundred and fifty important Bible verses, about fifty hymn-verses, and the whole *catechism text* several times over. Moreover, as will appear from the next article, the matter will not only have been learned, but will to a great extent have been comprehended by the children and have become a living force in their life.

THE THOROUGH PREPARATION FOR THE CATECHETICAL CLASS.

BY REV. F. W. ABICHT, MARYSVILLE, OHIO.

In a former issue (February, 1903) the writer attempted the discussion of the *importance* of a thorough preparation for the catechetical class, and now, after some delay, it is his purpose to discuss the preparation itself. He deems it well to reiterate his firm conviction that a thorough preparation for this duty of the pastor is quite as important as the preparation for the preaching of a sermon. There has been no refutation of this standpoint taken, nor can there be on Scripture grounds; but if there had been, a simple question would suffice as a counter-criticism: Is not the danger of underrating the importance of catechetical work incomparably greater than that of overrating the same? It undoubtedly is, and hence the practical tendency of this position is timely and salutary, and the example of Christ and the Apostles in emphasizing strongly the things especially needful at certain times and places warrants the correctness of giving what may seem to some undue prominence to the great importance of catechetical work and the preparation for it. After drawing attention to the importance of this work, it will now be necessary to make some suggestions as to the preparation itself, both general and special.

The inadequacy of catechetical or pedagogical ability in the average pastor of our day and times is a deplorable thing, which to remedy is desirable and practicable. In discusisng the problem before us, we must go back to the origin of the deficiency in question, to the schools, wherein our preachers and pastors not only, but also our catechists are prepared for their work; but at the same time it will be needful to offer some helpful hints and suggestions to the brethren already in the ministry, as to how the lacking requisite may, in various ways, be supplied. Many are not to be blamed for the conditions existing in this regard, as, for instance, when it comes to the English brethren, there is a really deplorable lack of good Lutheran literature on

Catechetics and catechetical matter in general; and frequently the attention and time bestowed on this branch of Practical Theology is miserably little. To endeavor to master this subject sufficiently for successful work along this line, to do so theoretically and practically in the short space of six months or a year, as has been attempted, is futile all the more, when branches fundamental and supplementary to it, are most conspicuous by their absence. Without the least desire to criticize uncharitably any particular institution at home or abroad, having in mind only the salutary amelioration of matters, the writer but wishes to lend a helping hand along this line. There have been laudable and successful attempts to remedy matters in some quarters of our Church. This is gratifying. Let the good work continue by all means.

I. THE GENERAL PREPARATION.

By this is meant the catechist's training and equipment in the college and theological seminary, but no less the pursuit of catechetical proficiency, when the school days are of the irretrievable past. The reason for including both of these is apparent: the object to be attained is to raise the standard of catechetical education in our synodical institutions, and also to incite to private effort the deficiently prepared catechist already in the field, who recognizes the importance of the work, who desires to improve his equipment and who is conscious of the possibilities still at hand to do so. The consideration of such general training must necessarily precede that of the direct preparation of individual lessons. But it would seem called for to discuss the studies and branches of a fundamental and indirect, as well as those of a direct and superstructural nature.

1. The subjects of catechetical activity are the souls of human beings and, as a rule, the souls of Children. Hence there are intellects to enlighten, feelings to direct and wills to persuade. Negatively there are evil propensities and faults to restrain and positively good gifts to develop. There are perceptive, reproductive and discursive

powers to handle; desires, affections and emotions to guide, to curb, or impel and awaken; motives and volitions to call forth or repel. The catechist must understand the nature and office of these several powers of the human soul. This is fundamental. He must become conversant with the study of psychology, the science of the human mind and soul. Abstract psychological theory and abstruse philosophy may serve their purpose as a means of mental culture and an opportunity for mental gymnastics, and may do so even in the catechist, if time and opportunities will permit, but a thorough study of Empirical Psychology is what he most needs as a propædeutic for his catechetical training. Walking on the solid ground is less precarious and dangerous than soaring in the air. Wandering about in the labyrinths of the more abstract and speculative systems of philosophy, whosesoever these may be, has, to put it very mildly, the tendency to produce the impractical hobby-rider, who forgets the serious and all-important object and purpose of psychological study as fundamentally connected with catechetical preparation.

It is certainly well to note that teaching applied solely to the intellect, or the feelings, or the will, is dwarfing. Such one-sided teaching does not bear the fruit we desire. The results of this mistake are frequently woefully evident in the different results of the catchetical class in particular, no less than in the parochial and public schools in general. Who has not seen to his sorrow that his brightest catechumens have become the sore spots in the church in after years? The cause is not hard to find; it was all head and the gratification and flattery of fond parents and teachers (also the pastor!) turned the heart into a wrong direction. In psychological study too much stress cannot be laid on the fact that only for fruitful inquiry's sake do we distinguish faculties of the mind by classifying and sub-classifying, but that all the while it is still the one mind and soul that has this variety of powers. The neglect to do this works havoc. We must not only instruct and explain, but

also arouse and incite, move and persuade; must not only remove error, but quell the evil sensibilities, restrain from evil action. The neglect to do this produces religious babblers, who deny the power of divine truth, the scholastic, rationalist and hypocrite; or the emotionalist, ascetic and fanatic; restraint on the one hand and development on the other might have avoided it. The soul and mental makeup of man is a manifold and wonderful entity and the study of it demands serious, reverent and prayerful attention at the hands of him, who is to deal with its various powers in the classroom of the church.

It dare not be forgotten that the soul and mind is an individual, that we are not made on a last like so many shoes, or molded in the same mold like so many castings. So little are men alike in their individual makeups, that one can rarely, if ever, find two exactly alike. After the thorough study of the generaliations of Psychology must be considered the specializations of individual make-up. We must study human nature in the individual. You can do many things with men, if you know them and know where to seize and hold them. You can do nothing with many of them, if you do not heed this. The harp of Truth has thousands of strings, and the human heart may be made to respond to some; and not to others. In the intellect, sensibilities and will, in all there may be in the individual a favorable place of attack, as it were, and to find this the student of human nature makes effort. It seems to us that at least some elementary suggestions on this point might be made to the students in our colleges and seminaries, so that they may afterwards not waste too much valuable time in tumbling to the fact that one cannot shear his pupils over tthe same comb, even though the differentiation never be made apparent to a single one of them.

The subject on which we are about to work must be known, both as an individual and as a species of a whole class. Then we proceed to find well-considered and approved methods of applying remedies. Of remedies one may speak quite advisedly, because it is a crippled, diseased

and defective subject that is in question — sinful, depraved man.

2. We want to *teach* in our catechetical classes, teach to know, to feel, to will and to do. We must have in hand ways and methods to do so. The knowledge of the human soul and its operation is here. But the soul and mind is a very delicate thing, easily harmed like a fine watch. Experimenting will not do. Approved and tried methods must come into play. We have these in Applied Psychology or Pedagogics. Here are methods based not only on abstract reasoning from mind to method, but also on careful, well-tested experience of master workmen. Undoubtedly, the Scriptures must be mentioned at the head of the list of text books, not only because they contain many express and plain prohibitions and injunctions in this line, but because in them stands out in bold relief God as the Master Pedagogue with His methods of killing and quickening by Law and Gospel, and many examples of holy men and women who understood the art. Then come the numerous pedagogical *dicta* of Luther, who may well be termed a pedagogue of eminent insight and almost miraculous fullness. And then a long line of able writers and practitioners in this work, like Comenius, Pestalozzi and so on down to Herbart and Ziller. Pedagogy should never be missing in the curriculum of a seminary designed to train catechists as well as preachers and pastors. It forms a necessary bridge between Catechetics and Psychology, and we cannot afford to be floundering around in the broad stream of uncertainty in the application of the one to the other. It could but greatly benefit to study thoroughly such works as *Lindemann's Schulpraxis,* or, if that be inaccessible on account of the language, of Gordy and White, who offer Psychology as applied to teaching.

The writer was once confronted with the remark: "Our seminary and college at ——, does not develop pedagogues, which it should." That seemed to be a very strange fault to find in a school designed to educate ministers of the Word, but it has long since been better understood. To be sure,

theological schools and their colleges are not expected to turn out finished and expert pedagogues, but it is undoubtedly reasonable to demand of them that the ministers trained therein should have received a sufficient elementary pedagogical equipment to such an extent, that they will not publicly and privately contravene almost every common principle of child-training and teaching. This is all the more necessary, because our country is naturally a place, where pedagogical sense, to say nothing of aptitude, is mostly conspicuous by its absence. To say nothing of needing it as a superintendent of his own parish schools (in our circles he generally has none!), and needing it in his own house, and family, which Scripturally, is to be an exemplary one, the minister needs it in the Sunday-school, he needs it as a pastor, and he needs it most of all in the catechetical class. God speed day, when the blessings of a better pedagogical training of our ministers shall rejoice those under them and benefit their whole environment by their presence!

So far the discussion has turned on the fundamentals of an adequate catechetical training. The writer feels that he will be deemed as reaching out very far, but is convinced that some few hints and suggestions of this nature are timely and really essential unto an intelligent elucidation of this subject. There are, of course, an endless number of branches that offer the mental culture necessary for this work, and far from going astray from the point in view at the outset, reference has been taken only to a few essential fundamental branches. It remains to offer a few remarks on branches or requisites of such a nature, that they come directly into play in this work.

3. A study found in the curriculum of every seminary, deserving the Lutheran name, and which brings into direct operation the studies alluded to above, is that of Catechetics. German Lutheran literature is rich and varied in works on this subject, but the scarcity of them in the English language is simply deplorable. One might well cry out to the ambitious and able writer in our Church, who has time and inclination, but lacks a theme: "Strike here!" To furnish a

list of works along this line and accompany it with a terse, but plain characterization, would be a praiseworthy work; still more meritorious would be the translation, with more or less fullness, of good works or the writing of new works, containing the results already attained or some of them in the English language. Why do not some of our rusty pens get a move on themselves? This study deserves an important place in every theological school, and it is gratifying to notice that this study extends throughout the three-years' course at our own school at Columbus. What a decided change for the better this is, when we reflect on the time, not so long ago, when six months of Catechetics on the basis of Rambach's booklet, a mere outline, and catechizations held before the class, was all the opportunity afforded to the catechist-to-be! A mere fraction of this time was devoted to Catechetics itself! It is unnecessary here to take any extended notice of the idea that catechism *lectures* are more "up-to-date" than catechization in the strict sense of the term. The old that is good is to be preferred to the new that is very much less so. Who cannot and will not see that the strictly pedagogical question-and-answer method will better arouse and hold the attention, incite to thinking and give a splendid exercise in the expression of religious thoughts, feelings and intentions?

Side by side with the study of Catechetics or succeeding it should come the practical exercise of composing and conducting catechizations, together with the helpful criticism of the professor and class-members, or of the pastoral conference, as the case may be. It will apply here as it does in sermonizing, that the rule, at least for the beginner and for a period of years, should be to write out the work *in extenso*. "Writing makes an exact man." No one can become well skilled in catechization any more than in sermonizing without using pen and paper freely. It has advantages which are only too often harmfully underrated. It assists the brevity of the lesson, not to be forgotten as important especially with children; clearness and conciseness of expression and language, again a point of special

importance with young minds; order and logic of thought, as necessary here as in the sermon. And even in after years it will benefit to make critical written work. Along the line of catechizations also, our German Lutheran literature is rich and varied and all sorts of practical helps are afforded, which are sadly wanting in the English language. The writer who wishes to fill a want, should "ponder well and heed!"

4. It may be considered as trivial, if not actually insulting to the brethren who read these lines, if special attention is drawn to the fact that the Catechism, or the Bible History, hymn or other catechetical matter, must be well known and understood by the catechist. It, however, needs only to be mentioned that evidently Dr. Stellhorn, our eminent and scholarly teacher, did not think so, when he began and continued his exegesis of the Scripture proof passages in our Catechism. Again, it needs only the mention that, for instance, our German Catechism of Luther was not written in modern times, but in a time when some words had at least something of different significations. The subject-matter will have to become a part of one's self, it must be digested. A candid self-examination will reveal to any one almost among our ranks, that there is fully enough reason for emphasizing our needs in this respect. If there still be doubts, Luther's own confession should dispel them. He was a daily student of the Catechism and still at an advanced stage of his life he could not master it as he desired. Not only should there be, as there is, the study of this book on our college curriculum, not only should this branch be made one of the most important of the day, but stress should be laid on it in the seminary itself, in order that the connection of question, answer and proof passage be understood and so treated and the disjointed and dry efforts be avoided. The subject matter well in hand, it will prove an easier task to present it to others in the variety of ways and forms, which Catechetics suggests.

(The special preparation of the catechization will follow in the next number.)

DOES THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS EXIST IN OUR SYNOD IN ITS TRUE CHARACTER?

BY REV. JOSEPH BECK, A.M., RICHMOND, IND.

In treating this subject, the writer is compelled to answer in the negative. But in doing so must admit of some noble exceptions. We have pastors and congregations and even District Synods that have displayed a zeal in this line of work, most commendable. Nor do we ignore the fact, that Synod as such, has during the past twenty years, made advances along this line which are truly praiseworthy. But admitting all this, we must confess, that as a body of Christians, we are far from possessing the true spirit of missions. Agitation upon the subject is timely, and hoping that these lines may assist in awakening such a spirit, they are submitted to the readers of this magazine. In order to answer the question at the head of this article, it behooves us to ask and answer another question, viz.: What manner of spirit is the true spirit of missions? It is spontaneous. No halting between two opinions, but like Paul cries out: "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" When that apostle received his sight, he went into the very city, to which he had been sent to persecute God's people — preached to the Jews, whose High Priest had commissioned him to hale men and women to prison, and in their very synagogue, that Jesus Christ whom they crucified, is the Son of God. His mind was possessed by the Spirit of Christ, and at once the spirit of missions entered into his soul and became the power that ruled him. He says: "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." He did not halt between two opinions. He did not allow the knowledge of his own frailties to overcome him. He acknowledged and obeyed that one impulse. "The love of Christ was the mainspring of all the machinery of his action; the word of Christ the chart of his voyage;" and the hope of glory through Christ, the magnetic power that continu-

ally drew him on from sacrificing, and being sacrificed for the cause of Christ. To be in touch with the spirit of missions we must feel the force of the precept: "What thine hand finds to do, do it with thy might."

While Christians, as in conferences and synods, are pausing, waiting perhaps, for some possible openings in the distant future, souls by thousands are sinking into an irredeemable death. Imagine yourself, dear reader, standing upon the summit of a high mountain, looking down upon a troubled sea, lashing itself against the sides of that mountain and between you and the raging sea, are human beings slowly sliding down toward the boiling waters. With help at hand, would it be the proper thing, to pause and delay action, while we are discussing possibilities and impossibilities from a human standpoint? No, we will act promptly and put forth every effort in our power to save these helpless ones from a watery grave. Now, as Christians, we have "vast coils of rope and a great anchor of hope, fastened by that wonderful cable of promise, ample for the support of untold millions without breaking." We will cast them out among the great multitude of perishing souls, with the hope that some will take hold, and be rescued from the grave of eternal death. We are doing something, and indeed no little thing along this line. We do not understand the writer as belittling the work of our Synod. Within the last twenty years a deep interest in mission work has been awakened, and Synod has made remarkable progress. In 1870 Synod consisted of five small districts, now there are ten, and all in a growing and prosperous condition. No one can calculate the good that has been done; and the present success augurs great things for the future. But who is ready to say that she has done all that she could and should have done, in throwing out the light that is within her for the illumination of darkened souls. Over ninety-thousand communicants in her fold and yet prescribing to her Mission Board a limitation of expenditures to $15,000 per year. Does this show a quick and ready response to the needs that are beyond us and round about us? If we rightly un-

derstand the spirit of missions, it means the unconditional consecration of service to Christ. Paul says: "I conferred not with flesh and blood." He made no stipulations. He had no mental reservations. He asked no excuse, for no delay. And such must be the spirit of every Christian and every body of Christians who would efficiently subserve the interest of Christ's kingdom. Like Samuel we must submit ourselves saying: "Speak Lord, for thy servant heareth." Like Israel at Carmel we must exclaim, "The Lord He is God — all that the Lord hath spoken that will we do." We must feel the rebuke which the Savior gave to the man who said, "Let me first go and bury my father," "Let the dead bury their dead, follow thou me." The King's business demands our service. And this implies that the true spirit of missions is more than spontaneity and obedience to the call of the Master. It means the reservation of nothing, as to time, talent property, ease, friends, home and comfort. All these are to be laid at the feet of Christ. Here we again refer you to the life-work of the apostles, in whom we find the example of a true misisonary spirit. They forfeited the good will of all their old friends, forfeited their social position and all of their worldly prospects by espousing the cause and the name of Christ. Paul flung the banner of the cross in the faces of the very men with whom he had been associated in the work of persecution. No wonder that he could assert: "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live — and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." He gave up a life of ease for one of hardship; loss and suffering for the sake of the truth which he advocated. Had he remained at the feet of Gamaliel, it is reasonably certain, that he would have succeeded to the place of the chief Rabbi. With the brilliant talents he possessed he would have gained renown in any ordinary walk in life. But he sacrificed them all at the foot of the cross. He gave himself up to labors almost superhuman, and to perils most alarming, and to suffering beyond the power of ordinary men to endure.

All this that he might preach Christ among the heathen, "and make known to them who were without God and without hope in the world, that only name, given under heaven among men, whereby we can be saved." And this, dear reader is the only true spirit of missions, in any age of the world.

Paul was but a recent convert from Judaism, and yet he could say: "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord. How much more should this spirit be in us, who have "from childhood known the Scriptures?" If we concede that Paul did not overstep the bounds of Christian duty, when the number of heathen nations was small, how shall it be with us, when they are greatly increased? And now we come to the question: Does this spirit exist in its true character in our Synod and in our congregations? This we concede is a difficult question to answer. We do not want to impute wrong in individual cases, nor do we want to ascribe to the sinful inaction of man, that which the purpose and providence of God prevents or retards. To do so would be to reproach the great Ruler of the world for the tardiness of his operations. God's ways are not our ways, we know, and it is not for us to discuss or find fault with his inscrutable purposes. But let us look at the results of human effort and from these draw our conclusion as to whether or not a Pauline spirit is ours. Reference has been made to our mission work at home, but again let me ask, are we satisfied with our present status? We are allowing an average of 15 cents per communicant to be expended for missions. This indeed is small enough to fiill us with shame, but when we calculate that a large share of this is contributed by the children, and that again no small amount of the children's offering comes from their own earnings, we need to hang our heads with shame. When we add to this that some members in every congregation are contributing their 25 and 50 cents and yet others still larger sums, the fact is apparent that many of the ninety thousand communicants are giving nothing toward propagating the Gos-

pel. It is well for us to bear this in mind, for if we have not the apostolic spirit, we should have it, and the question will then arise: How can we foster and encourage this true spirit of missions in our congregations? But are we content with dragging our slow length along, in providing somewhat for the spiritually destitute in our own land? What are we doing in the wide waste of heathenism? Look away to far-off India, Africa, China, Japan and other broad lands, peopled with millions, benighted with sin, what are we doing toward sending the gospel light to these multitudes of perishing souls? You say, something. We have a foreign mission treasury and moneys flowing into this fund are expended through the Hermannsburg Mission Society. It is something, we admit. Through it possibly a "fountain has been opened — an oasis has begun to bloom and spread — a tent as of wayfaring men, has been pitched." Granting all this, can we say that it is according to our ability? Is it not reasonable that a field of our own would enlist greater interest and activity, and consequently more liberal offerings? It is a mere make-shift as it is. One of our congregations has chosen to support a missionary in Persia, and it is safe to say that her offerings are greatly increased thereby. May we not expect some good results from the action of Synod at Michigan City, and hope that it will lead to such action at the next meeting of that body as will open a field of our own, in one or more of the many heathen countries.

Dare we close our eyes to the fact, that we are doing nothing for the spiritual enlightenment of our recently acquired land possessions? Other religious bodies are stretching out their arms to help, but ours are still folded. We are sitting idly by, and with apparent indifference, see the American Indian slowly perishing for want of the truth, and not a hand lifted to bring him the Gospel. Our work among the Negroes moves along at a snail's pace. The small beginning we have made does not receive proper support and encouragement. When we come face to face with the people at home and abroad who need assistance, and see how little we are doing outside of our own parishes to uplift the

fallen, must we not confess that the spirit of missions is at a low ebb among us? During the last year, or year and a half, our ministerial ranks have been greatly depleted. Some of our best men have been taken from us. Does this mean nothing? To the mind of the writer it has a signification. May it not be a judgment upon us for our slothfulness? With a Hans Egede or a Fred Schwartz among us, we might believe that the "royal legacies of the rich and the humble gifts of the poor" would have fallen together into the treasuries of our Synod and gone out to gather a rich harvest of souls. Every member of the Joint Synod of Ohio and other states should have and manifest a deep concern about Synod's action upon the proposed establishment of a foreign mission field of our own. Until the spirit of missions, which is the spirit of piety and self-devotedness to the Church, is possessed by our ministry and people, we cannot expect to discharge the solemn obligations we are under to our ascended Lord. We cannot do what God requires from us, in the conversion of the world, unless we break away from our sealed houses, and contribute of our abundance for the carrying of the Gospel to sin-trodden souls. Nor can we meet the measure of our responsibility by offering up a few prayers for the success of missions and passing a few resolutions concerning purposes well-meant, but long deferred. The work, indeed, is the Lord's and cursed is he that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm, whose heart departeth from the living God!

But his purpose is made plain, so that a wayfaring man may see it, and know it. The Church in the employment of the means of grace is charged with the responsibility of doing the work in humble dependence on His blessing. But with all the efforts that have been and are being put forth to lift the world out of sin by filling it with the light of divine truth, are we not convinced, in that so little has been accomplished, that the obligations laid upon the Church are not rightly understood? What with her wealth, her numbers and her influence, in the employment of the means of

grace, could she not do, if possessed of that spirit of self-sacrificing devotedness to the cause of her redeemer which distinguished her primitive members? Then she would go forth in the spirit of might to accomplish the predicted glory of Zion. Under the influence of this spirit, the unhallowed ambition and pride now fostered even in the Church, and the love of worldly ease and pleasure would vanish from her presence. Wealth now hoarded by a miser's hand, would flow into the treasuries of God's house, to do its might in making straight the way of the Lord among the children of men. Talent and learning now used in vain speculations, for the gratification of more selfish interests, would be cheerfully devoted to the service of the divine Master. Many of our young men would make pilgrimages to the scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary, and after imbibing their spirit, return with hearts filled with the love of Christ, ready to leave all and follow him, by making known the rich provision of His eternal love to a perishing world. That spirit in our congregations would cause their people to pour forth their supplications, borne on wings of faith, to the throne of mercy, imploring the interposition of God's Almighty arm and the communications of His Holy Spirit. That arm would then be made bare for salvation and that spirit poured out from on high, and Zion would look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.

Ask, seek, knock, the Saviour says, and it shall be given you. Ye shall find and it shall be opened unto you. Herein God stands pledged to give when we ask. He stands pledged to the giving of His Holy Spirit, by the reception of which we have all things. Need we say more? While much has been done, much more could have been done. And this should convince us that as yet we are far from possessing the true spirit of missions as it was taught by Christ through precept and example and as it was portrayed in the lives of the apostles. But how shall this spirit be implanted in us, and be given the necessary encouragement and nourishment? If we as yet do not possess the

true spirit of missions, we must conclude that there is a lack of information upon this subject. Hence we must arouse the attention of our people to the importance and urgency of this work. Education along that line is required. We must agitate the subject of missions. Cry out to the people. Proclaim it, not once or twice a year, but frequently. Show them the dark pictures of heathenism. Tell them the story of ignorance and crime, of idolatry and misery, which blacken the annals of heathen record. You can not exhaust the story. The tale of woes is depicted in newspaper and magazine, and is flashed over the wire by the lonely missionary in the far off dark continents of the earth. Read the correspondence from our home field and picture to the people the labors and the sorrows of our own missionaries, as they sacrifice health and comfort, in order that they may give spiritual bread to the hungry. Speak it out. Let them hear till their ears tingle, and their hearts ache. Tell it in the church, in the home and to the individual. To arouse a missionary spirit, means to educate. It devolves upon the ministry to awaken in the hearts of their people a sympathy and compassion for the spiritually destitute. They should be made to gaze upon the dead bones, which are scattered over the valley of the shadow of death. Let them see in all its horrors, the bondage of ignorance and idolatry, of cruelty and human sacrifices as practiced by the heathen. And when moved with pity for their wretchedness make plain to them the Christian's responsibility. It is only when men feel deeply that they act with energy. To call forth the energies of the soul into untiring action, to secure its accomplishment, the object must seize hold upon the heart. To attain success in any undertaking it is necessary to awaken an enthusiastic devotion in its behalf. But in order to foster and encourage a true missionary spirit among us, as ministers and people, let us not fail to train ourselves to a deep sense of dependence on God. We have spoken of the needs of perishing souls and of the responsibility laid upon the Christian, but let us not forget that men may plant and water, it is God alone that

giveth the increase. The spirit of unceasing and increasing activity in the work of saving souls, and the spirit of entire dependence on Christ and earnest believing prayers in His name must go together. The apostles united both. They labored with a will and with a self-sacrificing spirit, but with a consciousness that all human effort would accomplish nothing without the divine blessing. They went forth to contend "against principalities, against powers, against spiritual wickedness in high places," but not with confidence in an arm of flesh. They went from prayer to labor and again from labor to prayer, and this accounts for the success which crowned their untiring efforts. Our church papers have made appeal upon appeal, to their readers to prevail upon young men to enter our college with a view of following the vocation of the ministry, but no reference as we know, has been made to the divine command: "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest." Brethren, are we not trusting too much in the arm of flesh, and forgetting wherein our strength lies, and from whence cometh our help?

Look again at the lives of the reformers. Study the history of the great mission work of a Luther, a work only secondary to that of the first disciples, and tell us, did they not plead earnestly with God, and depend solely upon His co-operation? It is not meant by this, to charge that we neglect prayers, or that we do not pray with earnestness, but that we fail to press His throne with ceaseless supplications. What can be accomplished without the arm of the Almighty? And what can we not achieve, if that arm be made bare for salvation? Taking hold of our work, in the name of the Lord, and asking God's guidance and assistance, we shall see the great cause of the world's conversion moving on towards its ultimate triumphs, with an efficiency and a glory that will awaken new songs in heaven. Let us remember that the spirit of power was given when the disciples were making supplication with one accord in one place, and will be given in answer to the earnest, united, importunate prayers of God's people in every age.

Let us not keep silence, but cry out day and night: "Come, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live."

Dear reader, if I have not unduly estimated the importance of sustaining our agency in sending the Gospel to every creature, then it only remains to urge you, not forgetting my own obligations, to cultivate the true spirit of missions. What a pressure is brought to bear upon us: The claims of that Saviour who loved us and gave Himself for us; the solemn vows we have made before God and man; a world in sin; the fleetness of time; the shortness of life; eternity's retributions, and the achievement of the high destiny to which we are all called; all urge us to devote ourselves to the advancement of God's kingdom, by untiring effort to save souls.

Let us not become disheartened, neither let us fold our arms and watch the battle from afar. Is it not said: "All the ends of the earth, shall see the salvation of our God?" Are we not told: "That the glory of the Lord shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea?" O let us see to it that we have a part in its consummation.

DEVELOPMENT IN THEOLOGY.

BY PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Is there such a thing as a legitimate development, growth or expansion of theology? There always has been and always will and must be. Christianity consists of vital principles and truths that are intended to be applied in a theoretical and practical manner to all the problems of faith and life as these arise. Theology in the nature of the case cannot be purely reproductive; it must be progressive. If it is not such it ends in stagnation of life and in formalism of doctrine, as this is the case in the Greek Orthodox church or in the remnants of the Old Oriental churches, such as the Nestorian or the Abyssinian. The New Testament itself shows that and how theology must grow.

While it is true that Christ during his three years of intercourse with the disciples taught them thousands of things that are not recorded in the gospels, which are merely a chrestomathy of his sayings and doings, yet in the nature of things the detail points of doctrine and life which we find the Apostles develop in their dealings with the congregations could not have been given them *ipssissimis verbis* by the Lord, but were the application and adaptation, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, of the truths that he had taught them. How, for instance, would it have been possible for Christ to have told Paul in so many words how to correct the abuse in the observance of the Lord's supper in the Corinthian congregation at a time when neither Paul had been converted nor the Lord's Supper instituted, nor the Corinthian congregation in existence?

Again the development of a "new" theology has marked every page of progress in the history of the Church. Never was this more the case than in the period of the Reformation. What is now Lutheran and Biblical orthodoxy, the glory of our Church and the truth of God, was at that time "new theology," and that too, a theology of an extremely radical type. Let it not be forgotten that Luther and his coadjutors and with him the whole Lutheran and Protestant Church, have rejected all the Old Testament apocrypha and have thus cut out of the Old Testament as this had been received nearly fifteen hundred years by the Church with scarcely a voice of protest or doubt, fourteen entire books constituting about one-sixth of the whole collection. What could have been more decidedly "new" in the theology of its day than Luther's restoration of the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law? And the same is true of all the distinctive principles and practices of the Protestant Church over against the Church of Rome.

Nor have matters changed in this regard. Just at present the most conservative portion of the Lutheran Church is engaged in the work of a doctrinal development. The Free Conference between the Synodical Conference and the

advocates of the old views on the subject of Election has brought into the foreground the subject of the Analogy of Faith as this has never before been the case. It is impossible that our theologians come to an agreement on this subject by a mere reference to the teachings of the fathers, since these do not supply the data or the material needed. It is necessary on the basis of a common ground to develop independently and for the first time in the history of theology what the Scriptural teachings are in reference to this subject. In short, the formation of a "new" theology on this subject cannot be avoided.

In practical matters this progressive development of theology is a *sine qua non* at all stages of progress in Christian life. Neither the Scriptures nor the confessions have one word to say directly on such subjects as Secret Societyism or exchange of pulpits or admission of those of other faiths to our communion tables; but both of these sources contain the principles that in their special application to the concrete cases can decide what the position of our Church should be. It is however, necessary, as these and similar cases arise, for the Church to determine what the course of action should be and accordingly to establish a new rule for the congregations and the synods.

In principle then the Lutheran Church has at all times recognized the right and the duty of new developments in the doctrinal status and in the practical life of the Church. A theology or a theological principle or rule is not necessarily wrong because it is "new." It is true that what is so often labelled "new theology" now-a-days is no theology at all, but merely a conglomerate of false philosophical teachings that are being forced upon theological science, so that the term "new" has in the eyes of reverend students of God's Word almost been made synonymous with "rotten." Modern theology as a type of theological thought is distinctively anti-Biblical and subversive of the fundamentals of evangelical Christianity. The Higher Criticism, in itself and legitimately developed a necessary and exceedingly useful branch of theology, has been corrupted into a radical hypothesis of

a natural development of the Biblical teachings, which makes the Old Testament religion in particular, to use an expression of a leading protagonist of this school, the late Professor Kuehnen, "one of the leading religions of the world; nothing less, *but also nothing more.*" In these words the kernel and essence of modern radical theology has been given. It reduces the religion of the Scriptures to the level of other religions. It makes the Biblical system — if it accepts a system in the Bible — one of a kind, and not one that is unique and different from any other creed or faith in the world. It makes the Bible only one of the "sacred books" of the East and Christianity at most and at best only a *primus inter pares.* In this way the absoluteness of Christianity has been denied and the plan proposed that, consistently applied, modern views would lead to the abolition of distinct and separate theological faculties or seminaries and to make the teaching of religion and theology a part of the work of the philosophical department. In short, modern new theology as a school is thoroughly radical and rationalistic and even more subversive of the truth than was "vulgar" rationalism of a century ago.

But such "new theology" is not even new but only a change in the form of rationalistic unbelief that dates back almost to the apostolic period; and, secondly, it is no theology at all. On the rule of *abusus non tollit usum* such extravagant misapplication of a principle correct in itself does not vitiate the principle itself. The point is rather to determine exactly the limitation within which theological progress, by its very principles and character, is permissible and justifiable and also the rules that should prevail in the application of this development.

There can, in the first place, be no legitimate development of theology on the basis of a denial of the authoritative character of the sacred Scriptures. The Holy Scriptures claim to be the official documents, given by God, for the religion known as Christianity. They are the last court of appeal in all matters of faith and life. The formal principle of the Reformation still stands, that the Scriptures

and these alone have the final voice in deciding what we as Christians must believe and do. The mere "Thus saith the Lord" is decisive for theology, otherwise a different foundation is laid than that laid by the prophets and the apostles.

This does not mean that the Scriptures themselves are not to be made the objects of special research and criticism. Theology is in duty bound to show the reasons for her faith in the canonical books of the Scriptures. But as the truth of these books is a certainty to the Christian independent of any critical research, as he knows through the testimony of the Holy Ghost that these writings are of God and are the revelation of God, no criticism that makes anything else out of these than the revealed word of God can be *eo ipso* accepted by Christian theology. Such a criticism *must* be wrong. Just as in no concrete case two and two apples can make five apples, because by a process independent of any concrete cases we know that two and two are four, thus actual criticism of the Biblical books cannot lead to results as to their divine character contradictory to what we know independently of criticism. Biblical research may lead us to change our opinion on the author of a book in the Bible, or the time of its composition, or its immediate purpose, or its literary origin or history, but it can never, if applied on legitimate principles and canons, make anything out of the Scriptures than they claim to be and than they are recognized to be by the experience of the Church and of untold millions of believers for nineteen centuries, namely the Word of God, what constitutes the basis of all theological science.

Nor does this deny that theology can operate with data not directly taken from the Scriptures. There is such a thing as natural theology, and the data it furnishes can be welcomed also by Biblical theology. There is a certain field where revelation and natural theology overlap, as this is particularly recognized by St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans. The doctrine of sin can be all the better understood when viewed in the background of human

history and psychology. The Psalmist declares that the heavens declare the glory of God. But all of these things derived from extra-biblical sources are subject to the judgment of that which is given in Revelation. That which we learn from nature or from man concerning God or sin must be brought into harmony with what the Bible says on these subjects and can be accepted only with the proviso that they do agree.

It cannot be denied that the Scriptures have in the end only gained by such researches. The attacks of the Tübingen school on the New Testament have led to such a vigorous and detailed reinvestigation of the whole field of New Testament literature that, from the standpoint of human science, the books of the New Testament are now more firmly entrenched by history and criticism than ever before. A work like Zahn's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, in which all the books of the New Testament are defended with best of modern scholarship, would scarcely have been possible without the era of negative criticism. Even Luther's rather subjective and one-sided criticism of the Epistle of James would not now be repeated even by one holding the general theological position of the Reformer. The apocalypse, the authenticity of which was so much a matter of doubt in the Lutheran Church that even Dr. Walther did not think that a denial of its claim to a position in the canon was contrary to the Lutheran status of the critic, is now better established than ever.

All these things combine to emphasize the fact that theology, if it is to be Christian, must be based on the Scriptures, however much it may make use of critical and other means to determine exactly what the Scriptures teach, and any development of theology that is contrary to the Scriptures is no Christian theology at all, but the very opposite.

In the second place, no theological development can be recognized as legitimate within the Lutheran Church that goes counter to the Confessions. The latter are not inspired

but are recognized in the Church because they are known to be the correct exposition of the teachings of the Bible. They are accepted *quia* and not *quatenus.* It is perhaps an open question whether the latter is not at all recognized in the acceptance of the symbols. There have always been those in the Lutheran Church too, who, while accepting heartily the system of theology in the symbols even in its details, have not thought it obligatory to accept as binding some traditional exegesis there given, as, e. g. the statement of the Smalcald articles to the effect that the Pope is the Anti-Christ, as this and some similar matters have no connection whatever with the system of the theology laid down in the confession as such. The new Lutherans in Germany, especially as headed by the old Erlangen school, have claimed all along the right to develop still further the theology of the symbols. To this there could be no particular objection if this development were really only further extension and elaboration of this theology. But when, as in the case of Thomasius, in his *Person und Werk Christi,* it becomes the advocate of a Kenotic system that denies to Christ while here upon earth his omnipotence, omniscience and his omnipresence, the claim to being a legitimate development of Lutheran theology must be denied. The plain fact is that such a theology is not Lutheran at all and cannot claim to be a development of Lutheran theology. Again when the late Professor Frank declares that the absence of a particular paragraph in the Augsburg Confession on the inspiration of the Scriptures makes it good Lutheranism to admit the possibility of error in the Scriptures, the answer must be that this is not the case, because the confessions by their practical attitude toward the Scriptures show that they accept the very words of the Scriptures in all particulars as decisive.

The conclusion is then briefly this: That, recognizing the fact and the necessity of a development of theology, this development can be Christian only if it is in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures as the Word of God,

and it can be Lutheran only if it in accordance with the teachings of the symbols of the Church; and for us at least these two things are practically identical.

And that theology can and must develop along these lines lies in the nature of the case. The Spirit of God is still operative in the Church as He was in past centuries; and as new problems arise the Church is compelled by its very nature and mission to examine these phenomena and measure them by its standards. Only in rare exceptional cases do the Scriptures themselves contain direct and explicit statements covering such new phenomena. As a rule the principles and the practices must be extracted by correct processes from the Scriptures themselves. Many of these books are themselves "Gelegenheitsschriften"; letters, etc., written to meet certain definite emergencies, and their theoretical teachings of principle must be gained by hermeneutical processes and then applied to the doctrinal and practical needs of the Church. What the Church has, e. g., done on a grand scale in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, which is not *ex professo* taught in a single unquestioned statement in the Bible, the Church at all times is called upon to do, to determine the Biblical teachings on this or that subject as they come up for consideration. And in this sense doctrinal development, or "new" theology is the expression of the very life of the Church and is the way in which the Church expresses its activity over against the problems that surround it and that either will rule the Church or be ruled by it.

It is therefore wrong to condemn "new theology" in principle. There can be no denial of the fact that modern theological research has, within proper and legitimate limitations, developed matters that have enriched theology and that have proved the promise of Christ as true anew, that He would be with His Church always. There is no doubt that on some matters theology is understood now better than it was even in the days of the Reformation, however much we glory in the heroic faith of that time and should pray to be filled with the spirit of that greatest epoch in the his-

tor yof the Church since the days of the apostles. But who can deny that the modern presentation of the Scriptures according to which the historical character of the revelation given in both Testaments is emphasized, as this was never thought of by earlier generations of theologians, has been a positive gain to the theological science? Biblical theology, although a much abused science, is nevertheless a legitimate science, and one that opens up in wonderful beauty the different stages and steps in the revelation of God's plan for the redemption of mankind, and in doing so, by no means comes into conflict with dogmatics, the queen of theological science.

Again, how much better prophecy is now understood than it was when it was merely identified with prediction. The prediction element is, indeed, especially in the Old Testament, on account of its Messianic character, an all-important factor in prophecy; but since the fact has been recognized that the prophet is the oracle of God, speaking primarily to his time and for his time and is the preacher of God to his people, the province and sphere of prophecy has been enlarged phenomenally and the facts of the Scriptures that deal with prophecy are understood as never before.

It seems like a *testimonium paupertatis* to maintain that the Holy Spirit is now no longer leading His people into the truth; that theology came to an absolute stop two hundred years ago and that the theologian has nothing to do but merely to reproduce what others have found in former generations. Those indeed were the heroic times of theology; but along the lines that were then laid down it is the duty of the Church to develop the truth further and further in the mission of making theology the science of divine, revealed truth and Christianity the salt of the earth.

THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH UNDER CONSTANTINE.

BY REV. J. C. SCHACHT, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

As soon as Christ Jesus had ascended up on high, and the Apostles had begun their appointed work of preaching the saving Gospel, the persecutions of which the Lord had ofttimes spoken (Luke 10, 3; Matt. 10, 23), to His disciples began to molest God's gracious work among men. The storm of hatred and cruelty, which had been raging around the Lord during His days upon earth, now beat with violence upon those who labored to lead men to the enjoyment of the grace that is in Christ Jesus. Though inoffensive in their conduct, pure in their walk and conversation, benevolent in their feelings and aims, yet they were despised and abused as if they were a brood of hell. The signal for centuries of bloodshed was given in the stoning of Stephen, "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 6, 5.) This was an example of what the Lord meant when He said: "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake," and "the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord." And it was not long after this when Rome gave the world such an exhibition of cruelty and inhumanity as had never been witnessed before. Nero, the Emperor, vain, selfish and sensual in the highest degree, found it a pleasing pastime to see Christians torn to pieces by wild beasts. There was no chord in his bosom that could be touched by innocent suffering.

And this shedding of innocent blood continued, with only an occasional abatement, for a period of about three hundred years. The last and perhaps the bloodiest of these persecutions was that which occurred under Diocletion and Maximian in the beginning of the Fourth century A. D. Galerius, the son-in-law of Diocletian, influenced the Emperor to issue an edict, commanding all Christians to be degraded from rank and honor, that their churches be torn down, and their Bibles be destroyed by fire. Lactantius, speaking of this edict, says that it de-

prived the Christians of all honors and dignities, ordaining that, without any distinction of rank or degree, they should be subjected to tortures, and every suit at law should be received against them; and on the other hand, that they should be debarred from being plaintiffs in questions of wrong, adultery, or theft, and, finally, that they should neither be capable of freedom, nor have the right of suffrage. A greater cruelty indeed could scarcely be invented. Such an act places a premium upon iniquity; and it would certainly be a surprise if such inhumanity were not followed by a natural reaction. For a period of eight years "the whip and the rack, the tigers, the hooks of steel, and the red-hot beds continued to do their deadly work," and in spite of these instruments of cruelty, new converts were rapidly filling up the gaps in the Christian ranks. This, indeed, was a period of great prosperity in the Church, both in respect to her numerical increase as also to her degree of purity. It is true as Macaulay says: "It is seldom that a man enrolls himself in a prescribed body from any but conscientious motives. Such a body, therefore, is composed, with scarcely an exception, of sincere persons. The most rigid discipline that can be enforced within a religious society is a very feeble instrument of purification when compared with a little sharp persecution without.

But the time of rest came for God's people. The year 313 A. D. marks the turning point in the affairs of Christianity. In history Constantine the Great is most intimately connected with this turn in the affairs of God's suffering Church. In 313 he published the famous edict of Milan which gave his subjects the privilege of worshipping God according to the dictates of their conscience. "No man," it says, "should be denied leave of attaching himself to the rites of the Christians, or to whatever other religion his mind directed him, that thus the supreme Divinity, to whose worship we freely devote ourselves, might continue to vouchsafe His favor and beneficence to us." It further decreed that all places of worship that had been taken away from the Christians, should be restored with-

out cost to them; and that those who had paid a price for these places should be re-imbursed from the public treasury. This is evidence, indeed, of a decided change in the spirit of the heads of the government. The palace, which had hitherto been the seat of deadly hatred for everything that was Christian, now proclaimed words of peace and toleration.

This change of spirit is said to have been brought about by the conversion of Constantine. During his battle with Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge, he himself reported to have seen a flaming cross in the sky at noon-day, inscribed with the words: "By this conquer." But whether this story has any foundation in fact, may be doubted, though many prominent historians, Eusebius among them, have accepted it without questioning its reality. W. B. Smith in the Encyclopedia Brittanica says: "It seems likelier, however, that Constantine gave external reality to what was nothing more than an optical delusion or a dream." But it is a matter of little importance whether this miracle as reported has any foundation in fact or not, the weightier question in the life of Constantine is, whether his conversion to Christianity was genuine, and whether his motives for granting favors to the Christians were at this time anything more than political policy. On this point there is a great diversion of opinion among the historians, some warmly defending and others sharply repudiatin his Christianity. Lactantius, for example, is quite profuse with his praise, speaking of him as the mighty Emperor, who was the first of the Roman princes, to repudiate errors, to acknowledge and honor the majesty of the one and only true God, and to expiate the most shameful deed of others, by restoring justice which had been overthrown and taken away. When we consider, however, all the facts known to us in the life of Constantine, it does seem doubtful whether he really acknowledged the one and only true God. Surely, this can not be inferred from his edict of toleration, for in this he manifested the same leniency toward heathenism as he proclaimed for Chris-

tianity. It is doubtful whether Constantine at this time even believed the Christian religion to be the true religion. It is beyond all question that there was a painful ambiguity in his religious position, which was perhaps not fully removed until a few years before his death. In 321 A. D., only a few years before the council of Nicæan, "he gave orders that, if lightning should strike the imperial palace or any other public building, 'the harnspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.'" This is, indeed, a very strong indication that the Emperor was still halting between two opinions; and that the leaven of Christian truth, if it had entered his life at all, had not yet wrought those changes in his heart, which it works unfailingly wherever man does not intercept its way by stubborn resistance.

But how can we account for the peace that was given to the Church at this time, if we deny that Constantine had fully espoused her cause by the acceptance of her truth? Political expediency has already been mentioned as one reason for the spirit of toleration; and the other was the insurmountable strength of Christianity itself. The world had battled aginst the Church for a period of three hundred years, and one century after the other wrote the word "triumph" upon the banner of the Church. Surely, this fact must have appealed to all thinking men, no matter how much they despised the people of God. And history clearly shows that even before the time of Constantine the world was weakening, and that many of its most brilliant men realized that the Church was more than an ordinary force to subdue. The Church, indeed, is aware of this, for she knows the source of her strength. Her Lord has left her the gracious promise, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. And on the strength of this, she goes forward with an unwavering assurance against every foe.

But it must be remembered also that whilst peace was secured in one direction, hostility broke out in another.

When it was discovered that torture and persecution were not capable of laying waste the vineyard of the Lord, those who pretended to be friends began to tamper with her treasures, and to close up the springs of her life. When the world smiled upon her from without, the foxes were busy within attempting to destroy the vines which the Lord had planted. Unconverted men crowded into the Church, and the wordliness they brought with them tried to make itself comfortable where it can never hope to find a place. Having won the imperial sanction worldly and ambitious men came in, talked her language, conformed to her ritual, and no amount of watchfulness on the part of her honest members could prevent the intrusion of her disguised enemies. Then, as now, men were trying to destroy everything that was supernatural and mysterious among her treasures, in order to make Christ's religion something other than He gave. The Word of God itself became the object of men's hatred, the spirit of destructive criticism began to work as the leaven of unrighteousness. Constantine summoned councils, approved written creeds, in order to secure uniformity; but the battle that was begun in his day has not yet been fought to a finish. Although in this also we have the comfort that the pure Gospel will finally prevail, the skirmishes which it has won through these centuries are prophet of the final triumph.

And the triumph of Gospel is the victory of the Church. In all her battles and conflicts with great masses of men, with the civil power, with physical force, with ignorance and superstition, and with hostile philosophies, she will triumph and accomplish the work assigned to her. When the world had learned the lesson in the days of Constantine that the Church could not be overcome by shedding her blood, Eusibius wrote: "God restored to benign and smiling brightness of His providence toward us, so that by a most wonderful concurrence of events the light of His peace again began to shine upon us as from the midst of the densest darkness. Showing plainly to all, that God has been the ruler of our affairs at all times; who sometimes,

indeed, chastens and visits His people by various trials, from time to time, but after He has sufficiently chastened, again exhibits His mercy and kindness to those that trust Him."

If we remember that the Church is God's own foundation, and that He in His Word is the strength and life of it, we can readily see that no power, either human or superhuman, will be able to overthrow it. He will fight His own battles and do it successfully, for the weakness of God is stronger than men. With this assurance let us go forward, regardless of men's approval or disapproval. For the peace of the Church, whenever it comes, not men but God shall have the honor.

CHRISTIAN OR EVANGELICAL LIBERTY.

BY REV. P. A. PETER, VERONA, OHIO.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

In the year 1520, when Luther, after careful consideration of the lamentable condition of the Church, had become thoroughly convinced that a genuine Reformation of the Church was a necessity, sent forth his immortal three manifestos or public declarations, in which he clearly and boldly defined his position over against the grievous tyranny of the Papacy, which held the Church in chains and fetters of spiritual bondage, enslaving the minds and consciences of believers. These three grand declarations were his stirring Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, his Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and his immortal Treatise on the Liberty of the Christian. The first showed the necessity of a thorough reformation of the Church; the second was a clear exposition of the chief errors and abominations of Rome, and the third was a joyful, heart-cheering, consoling testimony of the renewing and transforming power of justifying faith, bearing witness for the glorious liberty of the fully matured believer, who has found peace and rest in the righteousness of an all-sufficient Redeemer.

During the Middle Ages, the Papacy had led the Church into a worse than Babylonian bondage. By his

great three manifestos Luther showed, how the captive Church could be brought back into the glorious freedom of the Gospel and the enslaved mind and consciences of Christians set free from the galling yoke of spiritual bondage. At the time when Luther's Treatise on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church was finished, the papal bull condemning the Reformer and his books, his suspension from his office, together with threatenings against him as a bold, bad and perverse hypocrite, reached Germany. The most fitting answer to the Pope's despotic utterance was Luther's Treatise on the Liberty of the Christian.

DEFINITION OF CHRISTIAN OR EVANGELICAL LIBERTY.

In the Treatise just mentioned the great Reformer shows that this liberty is "not a freedom from works, but a freedom from opinion about works, i. e., from the opinion that we are justified by works." Upon the evangelical basis of St. Paul, as expressed in - Cor. 9, 19, (Though I be free from all men yet have I made myself servant unto all), Luther said, "that b yfaith the Christian is a free lord over all things and subject to none," and yet at the same time, "that by love he is a servant to all things and subject to every one."

As a new creature in Christ, standing in a state of grace, regenerate and spiritual, the justified believer is indeed subject to no man, but as he is yet in the world and under certain obligation and duties to other men, he is their willing servant in love. The justified believer is free from the curse and condemnation of the law, and of sin, death and hell. He is also free from the ordinances of the ceremonial law of the Old Testament (Acts 15, 10; Gal. 5, 1; Coll. 2, 16. 17).

Luther says: "Who can now comprehend the honor and lofty dignity of a Christian man? Through his kingship he has power over all things. Through his priesthood he has power over God; for God does what he requests and desires. To these honors he comes only through faith." Luther says this "concerning the *inward* man, of his lib-

erty and *chief righteousness,* which needs neither law nor good works — of the *princeps justitia fidei.*" Again: "Man is inwardly, according to the Spirit, sufficiently justified (*justificatur*) by faith; it remains only, in this respect, that this faith and sufficiency shall continually grow until his entrance upon a higher life." (Köstlin's Theology of Luther Vol. I, p. 415.)

But as Christ took upon Himself the lowly form of a servant, in order that He might minister unto us, even so we, although free from all servile compulsion to obey the law, through justifying faith in Christ, should freely serve our neighbor in love for Christ's sake.

After treating very fully of the positive moral deportment of the justified, mature Christian in the various relations of life, with respect to his attitude to God, to his neighbor, to civil and political relations and the like, Köstlin says in his Theology of Luther, Vol. II, pp. 487, 488: "We have now reviewed in a general way, the entire sphere of activity within which the moral life of the believer moves on earth. His is not a monastic and contemplative, but a constantly active life. The works of the Christian within this sphere are holy and good, in so far as they are performed in faith and in accordance with the Word of God, who has instituted all the various orders of society. Christ has Himself, by His own life and deeds, purified and hallowed the entire earthly life of man."

The true Christian is not a dreamer, but a very practical, active person, who finds plenty to do in performing good works, which flow from faith and in agreement with the Word and will of God. What an honor to the Christian, that his Savior and Justifier has sanctified his life on earth in all its various relations by a perfect righteousness rendered in our stead!

Köstlin continues: "In the case of believers, moreover, who are new creatures, all good works are performed freely and naturally, even they conform to the requirements of the external statutes. We cannot properly say that a believer *ought to* perform good works, just as we cannot rightly say

that the sun ought to shine, or that a good tree ought to bear good fruit. The sun shines and the good tree bears good fruit as a matter of course (*de facto*). 'Those legal phrases do not reach hither.'"

Thus the believer, although subject to no man and free from all subjection to men, becomes subject to all by love in doing good works, flowing from true faith, — a voluntary subjection that has its ground in justifying faith.

Köstlin concludes his review of Luther's Theology with reference to the deportment of the believer in the various relations of life, as follows:

"We are thus brought back again, from the contemplation of the general course of life in which the Christian manifests his character, to the recognition of his *full, perfect* and *glorious liberty*. He is free in his conscience from the curse of sin and the law. He stands free, exalted in his conscience before God above all laws, since no appointed work is needed to secure his salvation and he is bound to no particular work, but all works that call for his attention are alike to him. He remains free, likewise, in his relations with his fellowmen — free in the service to which he devotes himself; free in his faith, in view of which no human ordinance can no longer bind his conscience; free in the love which subjects itself to laws, yet at the same time remains the mistress enthroned above all laws."

Thus Luther defined Christian or evangelical liberty and here is the standpoint of the Lutheran Church on this doctrine in accordance with James 2, 12: So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.

THE BASIS OF EVANGELICAL LIBERTY.

It is highly significant that in 1520 Martin Luther sent to Pope Leo X, a very humble and friendly letter in which he takes very charitable views of Leo personally, comparing him to "a sheep surrounded by a pack of wolves," assuring him of his willingness "to endure everything that is not opposed to the Word of God," and that at the same time he sent him his bold and joyful Treatise on the Liberty of the

Christian. It appears that Luther wished to warn Leo to beware of the Romish Babylon, "a den of robbers, an empire of sin and hell, and even the so-called vicars of Christ as genuine Antichrists." All this is well described in Köstlin's Theology of Luther, Vol. I, pp. 409, 410.

The great Reformer would be bound in his conscience by nothing else but the Word of God, and yet the spirit that pervades his great Treatise on evangelical liberty is not controversial but fervent, comforting and consoling, flowing from a heart firmly established in the faith, that has fully experienced the truth of the scriptural declaration, that the just shall live by his faith (Hab. 2, 4; Gal. 3, 11; Heb. 10, 38). The treatise is well characterized in Köstlin's Theology of Luther, Vol. I., pp. 410, 411, as follows: "We do not find this treatise pervaded by the spirit of conflict and wrath which marks the letter. It is throughout a positive joyous testimony to the power of that faith which is 'a living fountain, flowing unto eternal life,' and its aim is evidently to inspire the reader with joy. Luther does not here propose to address the learned. He aims to serve the plain people (*rudibus*), and open to them the way of knowledge. He will speak as one who has himself experienced in great and varied trials that to which he testifies. Most fervently, not in dialectical analysis, but in comprehensive, mystical summary, he presents the unity with Christ, effected by faith, and the salvation thereby bestowed upon the believer. From this profound apprehension of religious truth flows naturally, and without constraint, the reformatory principle of evangelical liberty. With the clear assertion of this principle, is, however, at once combined an admonition to loving devotion to the work of relieving the want of Christian brethren, and to a generous consideration for the weak and a self-denying restraint, upon their account, in otherwise justifiable efforts for outward reformation. Certainly a wonderful evidence of Luther's inner spiritual tendency was the preparation of *this* document in the midst of the greatest excitement of the conflict! And a remarkable and most significant act was the sending of *this particular docu-*

ment to the Pope, in connection with the candid accompanying letter. We rightly place it side by side with the Address to the Nobility and the Babylonian Captivity as the third chief reformatory publication of Luther. He would, upon his own testimony, have most gladly devoted himeslf to the preparation of just such works as this. The Pope may, as he tells us in the letter, learn from this little treatise the kind of work in which he would gladly, and might be fruitfully, employed, if the unchristian Papists would but allow it."

The two propositions, namely, that the believer, justified by faith, is a free lord over all things and subject to no man, and at the same time a ministering servant and subject to all men, are derived from the apostle's words (1 Cor. 9, 19): For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. In the following verses St. Paul illustrates the idea of true evangelical liberty by his own example among Jews and Gentiles, in that he might by all means save some. When among the Jews he observed Jewish forms and customs and Jewish modes of expression in his speech, although he no longer stood under the obligation to observe these external things (Gal. 2, 19). He even submitted himself freely to the ceremonial ordinances of the levitical law, although not bound to keep them (Acts 18, 8; 21, 23-26), in order that he might gain them that were under the ceremonial law. Among the Gentiles, who were not under that law, he did not observe Jewish forms, customs and modes of expression, that he might also gain the Gentiles for Christ.

Among the weak in the faith in Christian congregations, he became as though he were weak, that he might bring timid believers to a full understanding of the Gospel that makes us Christians "free indeed." Under all the various conditions of his apostolic ministry he adapted himself to the individual characters and dispositions of his hearers, always keeping in view the supreme object of his teaching and preaching: to win souls for Christ and the Gospel. And thus he made himself a ministering servant of all men and subject to all

in love, whilst at the same time he stood fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made him free and would not suffer himself to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage (Gal. 5, 1).

Luther's first proposition in his Treatise on the Liberty of the Christian, that the believer is free and subject to no man, refers to the spiritual man, the new creature in Christ. The second proposition, that the believer is the servant of all men, refers to the outward or natural man who must always remain in subjection to the spiritual man. The outward man must perish whilst the inward man is continually renewed (2 Cor. 4, 16).

In treating of Christian liberty, Luther always has in view the inward or spiritual man. First of all, he inquires "how an upright, free, Christian, that is a spiritual, new, inward man arises." He shows that nothing performed or accomplished by man can contribute anything to his *justitia* or *libertas*. Yea, more than that: "Not even speculations, meditations, nor anything that can be contributed by the exercise of the mind (*per animae studia*), can profit anything." Everything natural or worldly originating in or with man cannot bestow upon him Christian or evangelical liberty. Only the Gospel can make us "free indeed." The Gospel must be preached, heard and believed and thus faith is produced in the heart. By our Lord Jesus Christ all that believe in Him are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses (Acts 13, 39). Being fully justified by grace, through faith, believers have peace with God through their Lord Jesus Christ and enjoy true Christian liberty, the liberty of the Gospel.

Without the asurance of the justification of the sinner through faith in the perfect merits of Christ, rendered in behalf of the transgressoor of the Divine law, there can be no spiritual liberty. Luther rightly says, that the soul of the believer has nothing in which to live and be free but the Gospel of Christ. Here then we find the firm and enduring basis of evangelical liberty.

RELATION OF EVANGELICAL LIBERTY TO THE DIVINE LAW, WORKS AND ORDINANCES.

We have already noticed that Luther taught that "we cannot properly say that a believer *ought to* perform good works, just as we cannot rightly say that the sun ought to shine, or that a good tree ought to bear good fruit," and again that he said, "Those legal phrases do not reach hither."

Concerning the fulfilment of the Law by the Christian, we read in Köstlin, Luther's Theology, Vol. II., pp. 499-500: "Luther teaches, finally, that the Law is now also *to be fulfilled,* i. e., by true believers, however incomplete and mingled with sin their obedience may yet actually be. We must make earnest effort to that end. We are to learn from it what we have been, what is now demanded of us, and what we are yet again to become. References to this phase of the subject are seldom met with in the earlier writings of Luther, although even there not entirely wanting; and even in his later writings, when urging the importance of the Law, he yet, at the same time, always insists most earnestly that it is not the Law, but the Spirit working through the Gospel, that produces good works. The Law of itself without this Spirit, he maintains, remains for us a mere and killing letter. He goes so far as to declare that the Law, even in the case of believers, does not help, but only demands.. The aim of our obedience to the Law is not the attainment of righteousness before God, but the preservation of peace in worldly relations, the expression of gratitude toward God, and the setting of a good example to others."

It is evident that in the matter of our justification before God the Law and its works must be entirely excluded. Eph. 2, 8. 9. The Law cannot be taken into account when we ask the question, How is the sinner justified in the sight of God?

Luther taught according to Köstlin's Theology of Luther, Vol. II, pp. 500-501: "We can see from this what Luther means when he speaks of the *believers' glorious freedom from the Law.* Above all, it is no longer to be at

all taken into the account in the matter of our justification before God, or the relation of our conscience to God, which is to be determined by faith alone. Just as Luther holds that no works can here be at all considered, so is the Law likewise excluded. We are, through our baptism and the blood of Christ, absolutely free from all works of the Law and are righteous through pure grace, by which alone also we live before God. This position is confirmed by the citation of 1 Tim. 1, 9. Yea, he declares, 'the Law in the conscience is truly diabolical ,although outside of the conscience we ought to make of it a God, to exalt it with the highest praises, and call it holy, good, spiritual,' etc. Furthermore, since for the believer the threatenings and terrors of the Law have no longer any force, it is no longer for him a driver or taskmaster, but a good friend and companion. He is no longer under it, inasmuch as he now does good and avoids evil, not from fear, compulsion and necessity, at the dictate of the Law, but out of free love and with a cheerful will, just as though the Law were not in existence and as though such conduct were perfectly natural to him. In this sense, also, are we to understand 1 Tim. 1, 9. But it is specifically the believing and regenerate *as such* whom Luther here has in view. It is in perfect keeping with the position here taken, that, so far as the weak and sinful flesh yet manifests its presence in the lives of such, they too must yet experience the compulsion of the Law, and may even be compelled, for the exercise of their faith, for a season to realize anew, in assaults of spiritual temptation, its very bitterest terrors."

In connection with the *Relation of Evangelical Liberty to the Divine Law,* we may also here consider the relation of such liberty to works and ordinances, as set forth by Luther in his *Sermon von Guten Werken,* concerning which Dr. Köstlin says in his Theology of Luther, Vol. I, pp. 537-538: "With ever-increasing clearness is now unfolded the opinion of Luther as to the character and value of those works which, amidst all outer diversity, may yet be regarded, in a general way, as the fruit of faith, and must, as such,

be demanded. As every work is good only as a fruit of faith, and is otherwise only sin, so, he maintains, on the other hand, *all things are free* to the Christian through faith; and it is just in this freedom that the latter now serves his neighbor, and especially bears his infirmities. Without choice of his own, he freely accepts what is given him to do. He is thus free from all external ordinances. He fasts and watches, but, in doing so, he fixes his attention, not upon the works of abstinence themselves, nor up on appointed days, nor upon any appointed variety or kind of diet, but alone upon his own inward requirements, — upon that which the lust of his flesh requires for its restraint, and, on the other hand, upon that which it is able to endure without impairing the health, distracting the brain, etc. Even the outward observance of Sunday, by bodily rest, is for him (cf. *supra,* p. 175), not expressly commanded, according to Col. 2, 16. 17. In and of themselves, all days are for him holy days, and again, all days are working days. The special observance is only for the sake of the immature (imperfect) laity and the working people, in order that they may come to hear the Word of God. If we were all perfect and knew the Gospel, we might work or hold festival every day. Yet more outspokenly than in the Commentary upon Galatians (cf. *supra,* p. 312) does Luther now express himself in regard to the use which may rightfully be made of this liberty against even the express regulations of the Church. If one finds, says he, that he does not at present require such a restraint upon the flesh or that he would by observing the rules for fasting ruin his body, he should omit the fasting, despite all requirements of the Church or of his Order."

NOTES AND NEWS.

By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

The Catholic Church has organized and is successfully conducting a systematic international propaganda against the "red" radicalism of modern Social Democracy among the working people of the European states. It is claimed with some reason that this Church is doing more to solve acceptably the Social problem than any other single organization in existence, and the names of such prominent prelates as the late Archbishop Ketteler, of Mayence, stand high among the reformers in this department. The Munich "Arbeiter" reports that in South Germany alone there are 372 Catholic labor societies, with a membership of 58,-239. These organizations, for the purposes of mutual benefit and social intercourse, are entirely under church influence and are a strong counter agent against the Social Democratic agitation, as are also the societies under Protestant influence. Italy has some 900 Catholic labor societies with a membership of 200,000, more than one-half being in northern Italy. These organizations too provide for their sick and injured, and in case of death pay a sum to the bereaved. These Catholic societies form a national Labor League, which has also established some 1,400 loan offices, where the needy poor among the working classes can secure loans at nominal rates and easy conditions. The general affairs of the propaganda are managed b ya permanent *Comite dell Opera dei Congressi Cotholici,* which recently met in Bologna, with Count Pagamizzi as chairman. Among the resolutions adopted were the decision to spread circulars warning against radical Social Democracy among the laboring people of Italy. In Spain too, the work is thoroughly organized, there being in 45 dioceses, no less than 264 Catholic labor societies with a membership of 72,142. The chief agitator in Spain is the Jesuit pater, Anton Vicent, who established the first organization of this kind in 1867, and effected a national union of such bodies as early as 1870. The strongest repre-

sentative is found in the province of Barcelona, where the membership is 6,255. A unique feature of their work has been the establishment of evening and Sunday-schools for the members and their children, tens of thousands receiving the instruction her that cannot be secured at the poorly equipped schools maintained by the state. The evening schools, especially, are excellent, 25,000 or more working men receiving instruction, the teaching being done gratis by priests and educators in connection with the state schools. In Madrid are also the headquarters of the "General Association for the Study and Defense of the Interests of Working People" with a large membership of prominent representatives of pulpit and pew. This society in the last year originated eleven projects for the social reforms and some of these were adopted by the Cortes and have become laws. In Belgium the Catholic Working Societies have been united under the general direction of the "Secretary of Catholic Works," and the work is divided into six sections, viz., Aid and Pension, Christian Charity Among Laborers, Protection of Workingmen, Schools and Propaganda In Paris the Congress of Catholic Sociologists and of Catholic Social Revues was recently held with the president of the national *Association Catholique,* M. Salvatier, in the chair Its deliberations covered the subjects of Insurance of Aged and Infirm and the establishment for international union of Catholic Sociologists on the basis of the principles proclaimed by Leo XIII in his Encyclyca. In view of these facts says, that these data show that the practical battle against the red Internationale is at present carried on by the Catholics with all energy and on the basis of a splendid organization.

II. WOMEN AT GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

Although persistent efforts have been put forth by the authorities of the Prussian universities to limit the women contingent at these institutions, and this has resulted in reducing their attendance in Berlin alone from nearly

twelve hundred to half that number, yet the semester just closed reported 1,423 women in attendance as non-immatriculated students, called "Hoererinnen," and fifty-four regularly immatriculated women at Heidelberg and Freiburg. The Baden universities were the only ones where women could be immatriculated up to the beginning of the last term, but the Bavarian government announced several months ago that it would receive women on exactly the same conditions that prevail in the case of men at its three territorial institutions of Munich, Erlangen and Wuerzburg. This step on the part of the most conservative and catholic state in the German confederacy is significant, indicating that Prussian precedence is here too being ignored. The women contingent is represented at all the twenty-one universities except the extreme Catholic Muenster and the extreme Protestant Griefswald. These 1,423 irregular women students are distributed as follows: Berlin, 562; Munich, 22; Leipzig, 62; Bonn, 89; Breslau, 98; Halle, 51; Goettingen, 58; Tuebingen, 3; Heidelberg, 53; Strassburg, 103; Freiburg, 85; Wuerzburg, 75; Marburg, 18; Giessen, 11; Erlangen, 10; Koenigsburg, 67; Jena, 30; Kiel, 20; Rostock, 6.

III. ROME AND HERESY.

Through the quotations made during the recent heated debate in the German Parliament from the writings of the Jesuit professor in the *Collegium Germanicum* in Rome, Dr. De Luca, claiming the right for the Church of Rome in our day and date yet to inflict death as a punishment for heresy, this scholar and his teachings have become the objects of the liveliest interest among church people. The Berlin *Reichsbote* over against the Catholic journals which have been claiming that these medieval views of De Luca are those of an uninfluential minor light in the church, has drawn attention to the fact that in the papal Breve of October 18, 1898, Leo XIII has bestowed unstinted praise upon the au-

thor of the *"Praelectiones Juris Canonice,"* in which these principles of church law are advocated. The author as professor of Church Law (textus decretolium professor) in the Collegium Germanicum, is a leading trainer for that class of men who prove to be the real leaders in the life of the German Church. In the *"Freies Wort,"* the litterateur Grupel, has on the basis of original sources given a sketch of De Luca's teachings. From the position that the church, according to Leo XIII, is "the most perfect association," the Jesuit professor concludes that the church has a threefold unique power, namely legislative, judicial and executive (coactiva potestas). By this last is meant the power to inflict secular punishment, such as imprisonment and even death, and hence the privilege of using arms for the attainment of its purposes. This position De Luca endeavors to prove from the Scriptures. As God miraculously inflicted blindness on the Sorcerer Elymas and punished Ananias and Sapphira with sudden death, thus the church too has the right to punish and to take life. Paul's words addressed to the Corinthians, in which he asks if they want him to come to them with a rod (1 Cor. 4, 21) is to be taken literally and similar privileges to be accorded to the church. After referring to the old hypothesis of the two Swords, he quotes with approval the words of Cardinal Bellarmin, who says: "The church has gradually made progress. At first she only excommunicated, then added money fines, then banishment and finally added death penalty. Since in many cases the other forms of punishment do not attain the desired end, the only means left is to send the heretics into the other world as soon as possible." These sentiments and views De Luca then claims could and should be applied by the church of the present day. It should not be overlooked that prominent Catholic journals, notably the influential Cologne *Volkszeitung,* condemn the teachings of the Roman Jesuit professor as thoroughly antiquated and deny that he represents the sentiment of the church of to-day even to a limited degree.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. OCTOBER, 1904. No. 5.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

Glory to God alone! This sentiment rings through all our Lutheran Confessions. Nor was it foreign to the Christian Church in its earliest stage. The Apostolic Creed, in its every sentence breathes gratitude to Him who has made, redeemed and sanctified us, whose power and wisdom, and love are attested by every organ of the human body, by every energy of the regenerated spirit, aspiring upward and Godward. Every trace in any religion or creed whatever which expresses creative and redemptive power as immanent in the creature is pagan in point of origin and destructive in its effects. Such utter abdication of saving power on the part of man becomes particularly evident when the place of the Holy Spirit in the plan of salvation, as viewed by our Lutheran Church, is considered. The whole gamut of glories and joys from the first call to Christ to the perfect restoration of His image is the work of God through His Spirit, according to the Apostolic Creed and the specific formularies of our Church. It is not one of the least virtues of our system of doctrine that the Holy Spirit's mode of operation has been learned from Scripture. To look for special "tides of the Spirit," as the revival churches, results in the exaltation of human agencies over the divine one: the Word of God. A Lutheran knows no avenue of the Spirit, but the means of grace; therefore, for him the occasion when Christ is proclaimed is the "now" of the Spirit.

The secret of soul-winning is identified by the Lutheran Christian with the conscientious, faithful and correct administration of the means of grace.

However, every truth is liable to misconstruction and abuse. Neither the minister nor the church can confer the Holy Spirit. God confers His Spirit through His Word. So indestructible is the life-giving power of God's Word that souls have been begotten to life in dead churches and through unconsecrated organs. Yet such is not the rule! God's Word contemplates as soul-winners only men saturated with God's Word and endowed with God's Spirit. Why this essential distinction should be made, since the Word of God is accompanied by His Spirit, though it be proclaimed by an unconsecrated organ, is clear. The difference is this: Shall I use the Spirit of God as instrument, or shall that august Being use me?

Souls are saved through God's Word, but yet only the consecrated minister can aspire to becoming a soul-winner. The unconsecrated minister, whose own heart is foreign to the life of his message, can not and will not be a faithful shepherd. His own worldliness will, like a wall of ice, prevent the Word being efficient in the hearts of its hearers. That intangible power which we term personality will, by its unceasing influence, render nugatory the power exerted and the claims asserted on special occasions.

"Pay heed to *yourselves* and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." So positive and unexceptional is the divine demand for a consecrated ministry that no instance of continued success in the winning of souls is on record in Holy Scripture on the part of unconsecrated men. The teaching of experience endorses the former. Since the framing of the divine message is largely the work of the intellect and the successes of oratory result, as all art, in the glow of intense satisfaction, travesties of consecration in parish and pulpit are not rare. Yea, the foolish heart may even deceive itself by confounding professional zeal with consecrated activity which is altogether the product of the Holy Ghost.

Such spurious consecration explains the occurrence of what is at the same time heaven's tragedy and hell's comedy: the submergence of apparently consecrated men and women in the wave of moral disaster. The stunning fall is permitted by Providence to open their eyes to the unreality of their inner life. The equipment of the minister for this important, responsible work is not limited to the intellectual apprehension of the truth on his part, even though it be supplemented by the skill of impartation. To be so saturated with the Word of God, to be so anointed with the Spirit of God, as to be the facile organ of the Word, and for his personality to be so consecrated as to be the living exponent of the message, is clearly the scriptural ideal of a winner of souls. The main part of the minister's equipment should be spiritual. The nature of the office, God Himself, demands this. The dynamic attributes and the origin of this equipment become clear to us when we consider it under its scriptural name:

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

When we study the subject before us in the Holy Scriptures, it becomes plain to us that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a distinct gift of the Holy Spirit, or rather the gift of the Holy Spirit for a distinct purpose. The names applied to this spiritual experience prove the point. In Acts 1:5 Luke records the Savior's promise: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

In Acts ii: 4 we find the fulfillment of this promise: "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost," etc. In Acts 11: 15-17 the baptism of the Holy Ghost is described as being vouchsafed to the heathen, likewise, as a result of the preaching of the Gospel. Many other passages might be adduced to show that various names are given to one and the same operation; it is enough here to show that *baptizing with the Holy Ghost, being filled with the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost falling on them* are one and the same experience on the part of the disciples. But this act of God is not the

same as that performed in conversion and regeneration. The experience of the disciples demonstrates this clearly. They were indubitaly regenerated men, when Christ promised them the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. "Now are ye clean, through the Word," Christ speaks to His disciples long before the bestowal of the Pentecostal gift. (John 15: 3.) Whatever powers, privileges and duties the baptism of the Holy Ghost may condition and confer, the rule is that it is conferred upon believers already in possession of spiritual life, but that its powers are distinct from those ordinarily associated with the begetting of spiritual life in the soul, is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the eighth chapter of Acts.

Here it is recorded of the Samarians (v, 12): "When they believed Philip preaching the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. . . . Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For as yet He was fallen on none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (12. 14-18). More plainly the truth can not be expressed that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, whatever it may be, is the bestowal of a spiritual force distinct in point of time and type from that operating when faith is begotten. It appears also from Scripture that this distinct gift of the Holy Ghost is not confined to the youth of the Christian Church. The Pentecostal sermon announces: (Acts 2: 38) "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord, our God, shall call." Having shown that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a gift distinct from the bestowal of repentance and faith in regeneration, let us see what the baptism of the Holy Ghost is.

II.

The baptism of the Holy Ghost is nothing less and nothing more than the divine equipment for the functions of our discipleship. This equipment may vary according to person, time and place. But it is clearly the teaching of Holy Scripture that the functions of our Christian service are to be performed not in our natural strength but through an endowment of the Holy Spirit commensurate with our divinely-assigned tasks. The true, faithful disciple has His strength in the Lord. The specific name may be a question of taste and an object of dispute, but the fact can never be that the disciple's equipment, whatever his calling be, must be furnished by the Spirit of God. The performance of spiritual tasks with none but natural powers is far from rare, but invariably it leads to discontent and spells ultimately failure.

It is clear that the minister and every disciple needs to seek the Holy Spirit's powers for quite other purposes as well as those of regeneration and renewal. To be in the performance of every task, whether distinctly sacred or nominally secular, the instrument of the Holy Spirit, should be the aim of the disciple and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or if that term is inacceptable, the equipment for service by power from on high, is the realization of that aim.

By this method Saul of Tarsus was equipped for his work as a soul winner. "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him, said: Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and *be filled with the* Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes, as it had been scales and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized. . . . . And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues that He is the Son of God." Why was his preaching such a phenomenal success? Because he was *filled with the Spirit of God.* Not all vessels are alike in point of size and material; to be filled, however, is a possibility for all alike. Luther was no Paul, yet he stands

beside him in massive, towering strength, because, like Paul, he had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

In the nineteenth chapter of the Acts a rapid maturing in grace and strength is described. *Disciples* who had been baptized by John, but were as yet so ignorant of the Gospel as to be unaware of the *personality* of the Holy Spirit, were taught concerning Christ and baptized into His fold. Then, through the laying on of hands, the Holy Ghost was imparted and they spake with tongues and prophesied. It is to be noted, however, that at Cæsarea the Holy Ghost fell upon the Gentile believers without such intermediate agency as the laying on of hands. The Word of God then contemplates the witness for Christ, whatever his particular place in the wide field of the Lord may be, as receiving his power in a source different from his natural endowment. It should come from on high. It is not the purpose of this article to confound the conditions of the genesis of the Church with those of the growing Church fully established, nor to claim that we should seek for a repetition of the endowment with exceptional and transient powers such as was given to the apostles: viz., inspiration and the charismata. But we do not hesitate to narrow our argument down to the incontrovertible claim that every Christian, to serve Christ well, can and must receive power from on high. Nor need we lose sight of the fact that spiritual power is bestowed through the means of grace. It is so bestowed. Yet many of us not heeding the warning of Paul to Timothy, neglect the gift that is in them. One person eats and assimilates his food and yet remains feeble and flabby of muscle, while another, by careful training, derives from the same food marvellous athletic powers. Thus one person is converted through the Word and yet remains such a spiritual weakling that his salvation is like a brand plucked from the burning, while another develops apostle-like qualities and successes. To be filled with power from on high is the sine qua non of equipment for Christ's service. This was the equipment of Christ Himself and of the disciples.

Christ was very God of very God. The fulness of divine powers was His. The wisdom of the all-wise God was enthroned in His reason. Music greater than of seraphic sweetness slumbered upon His lips. Yet, He did not stir from His lowly environment, till the baptism of the Holy Spirit had filled the vessel of His humanity and consecrated it as the dispensary of the water of life for the thirsty.

The disciples surely enjoyed a better than ordinary equipment for their high calling. They had sat for three years at the feet of the divine Master. They had listened to teaching absolutely authoritative because absolutely inerrant. They had witnessed a more than Titanic grapple with the powers of darkness then displayed in ghastly loathsomeness. They had seen the Master's almighty hand dispense with the ordinary processes of nature when love suggested speedy action. And yet, with all these advantages and exceptional features of training, they were strictly forbidden to stir one step upon their urgent mission until their equipment were completed through the vitalizing and clarifying impartation of the Holy Ghost.

There is no doubt that the average intellectual equipment of the ministry is inadequate. Whatever is calculated to furnish breadth of learning, ardor of eloquence and the mastery of a refined, strong popularity, should be part and parcel of the equipment given by college and seminary. Yet all learning and eloquence without power from on high is the glow of a fire of straw. There is no doubt that in these iconoclastic days when the attempt is made to define even soul and conscience as the fruit of the unconscious and resistless force of evolution, the Church should strenuously adhere to the form of sound words, yet defective methods and systems of doctrine are in a large part, neutralized, where the messenger and the church are under the control of the Spirit of God. Both Spurgeon and Moody would have been unwelcome in Lutheran pulpits, yet what Lutheran will doubt that their message resulted in the conversion of such vast numbers because they were *filled* with power from on high and thus labored *in His strength.*

III.

Being filled with power from on high which we take to be synonymous with being baptized with the Holy Ghost, will and must result in adequacy of equipment for the service of Christ. Whatever intellectual and moral endowment any one brings to bear upon the tasks of his calling, this and this alone complements all other qualifications resulting in symmetry of form and function. Of all elements of equipment for the service of Christ this is the one absolutely indispensable and the degree of its possession is the degree of faithfulness of him thus endowed.

On the day of Pentecost and shortly afterward the baptism of the Holy Ghost came upon the disciples like a tidal wave from the shore of heaven. The symptoms of its presence were evident to friend and foe. However, the conclusion would be wrong that the power from on high is no more bestowed upon the receptive disciple, because not all the symptoms of the heavenly gift have been transmitted beyond the era of the apostles.

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." (1 Cor. 12: 4.) Whatever calling a Christian has, to be equipped for it by the Spirit of God; whatever function of his calling a Christian performs, to perform it in the strength of Christ through the Holy Spirit, that is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. There are clearly differences of administration and diversities of operations, in God's kingdom, but in and through them all the Holy Spirit is the efficient force. "For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit dividing *to every man as He will.*" "And to every generation as He will," would not be an arbitrary addition. For though the times when the gifts of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy and the gifts of tongues have

been superseded by others, in which no extraordinary occasions require miraculous endowments, yet the operations of grace through the agency of men continue and for such operations the Holy Spirit must furnish grace and strength, if they are to be performed in the strength and with the blessing of our Lord.

Not ministers of the Gospel alone need this heavenly gift, since every disciple is expected to serve the Lord in and through his particular calling. The lawyer at the bar, the teacher in his schoolroom, the maid in her kitchen, the mother in her more than regal realm need power from on high as much as the gospel minister, in order to make their work part and parcel of an all-embracing discipleship. It is the weakness of the present age that a broad line of demarcation is drawn between that which is secular and that which is spiritual. If the humblest Christian workman would show in the performance of his lowly duty that repose, content, fidelity and cheer which suggest the abiding presence of the Comforter and the vitalizing of natural powers through such presence, the evangelizing efforts of the Church would be greatly augmented and the marvels of the apostolic age would, in a measure, be repeated.

We may seek, then, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as it is conferred to-day, not in the bestowal of miraculous powers, but in the bending and energizing of the natural powers for consecration and service. It is possible to prepare and to preach a sermon largely through the use of natural powers and, as long as only or mainly evangelical truth is presented, good will be accomplished. But suppose that through the force of spiritual habits and preparation, it is not the man that prepares the sermon, but the Spirit of God makes the minister's brain and heart the alembic, in which He prepares His *message* what a tremendous force in that case, the average pulpit would represent! No procrastination then in the preparation of the message! No idling away of precious time then, now so much in evidence among members of the holiest of callings! No platitudes then and largely extemporaneous utterances! No perpetual remain-

ing on the shore of the sea of revelation then, but a penetrating into its depths of truth, light and life! Because their natural powers were baptized with the very fire of the Holy Spirit, men like Luther and in a lesser degree, Spurgeon, could arouse in so many souls a sense of the beauty of the Cross. There the ideal of the Christian ministry is indicated; here the path of indefinite, of infinite progress is to be found which the most gifted person dare not forsake and which promises not a little success to those who are of mediocre intellectual equipment.

It is to be noted, furthermore, that this spiritual equipment always demonstrates its genuineness in magnifying Christ. "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart *to the Lord.*" Some men boast great spiritual powers but merely portray an ice palace of morals. The absence of the Son of God who is the Lamb of God, from their teaching brands their spiritual equipment as spurious. There are characters radiant with æsthetic beauty; however, if Jesus Christ is rejected as the high-priest whose vicarious atonement has secured the soul's peace, such beauty is no more than ornamental tinsel. The Holy Spirit has come to magnify Jesus Christ and His organs know nothing but Christ and Him crucified.

Realizing that he labors in the strength of Christ, only in proportion as the Holy Spirit uses him as His organ, the disciple will seek to secure for every task the special power commensurate with its greatness. In the second, the fourth, the ninth, the thirteenth chapter of the book of Acts it is stated that one and the same disciple is filled with the Holy Ghost on successive occasions, and once or twice repeatedly on the same day. It is not our purpose to enter upon a metaphysical analysis of this phenomenon, but, surely, the conclusion is just and legitimate that it is the disciple's privilege and duty to seek and to expect for every special task in the line of his calling adequate power and special grace. "As the man is, so is his strength," (Judges 8: 21). For

the Lord's work we need strength from on high, or we shall fail, but the Lord graciously vouchsafes to fill us with His Spirit that we may labor in His strength.

IV.

God's Word does not fail to give us directions to the attainment of such equipment for service. In sporadic cases the Holy Ghost may have called the impenitent and unconverted into requisition. This is not the rule, however. God does not use His enemies except to fling them away when He has used them. The illumination of Balaam was exceptional and uncovenanted.

Repentance is the condition for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as it is the condition of regeneration by the same egency. The call of Peter to the devout Jews on the day of Pentecost was to repent and to accept Christ. Then the Holy Spirit fell upon them and presently every one became a preacher of the Crucified Christ.

Nor does the Scripture warrant the belief that God calls and endows any one for his service, unless the ordinary channels of grace are used and kept open. Saul was baptized and filled with the Holy Spirit and the anxious Gentiles at Cæsarea received the Holy Ghost through the preaching of the Gospel. Revivalists and other sects who expect communications, directions and grace through other channels than the means of grace, show by the very methods pursued that the Spirit which fills them is not of necessity, the Spirit of God.

Still, even regenerate Christians may be lamentably devoid of spiritual power, because they fail to meet the conditions. "We are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that *obey* Him." A surrender to God so utterly exclusive of self-will that life becomes a walk with God, a stage of holiness so steadily maintained that what is known to be sinful is persistently avoided, this is the obedience which will result in the gift of the Holy Ghost for our service.. And wherever men have wrought large results in the kingdom of God,

have led many to righteousness, or what is equally great, have courageously labored amid stupendous difficulties, they have possessed what is the virtue of Christian discipleship par excellence, unfaltering and unquestioning obedience. Specific prayer is another condition of being baptized with the Holy Ghost. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall the heavenly father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" (Luke 11: 13). Such asking must be the expression of an intense thirst. "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty and floods upon dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and mine blessing upon thine offspring." Where a Christian in the consciousness of his frailty, of the insufficiency of his own powers, thirsts and sighs for the refreshing waters of the Spirit of God and never turns hand to task without having looked up to the source of all true strength, there God will bestow such a measure of His spirit as to equip the toiler with commensurate power. Luther who spent hours in devotion when duties thickened and difficulties multiplied and time was fraught with peril; Moody who shut himself up for weeks with his Bible, illustrate the secret of spiritual strength. And if Harms found Hermannsburg a nest of scoffers and left it a Zion thrilling with intensest sympathy for lost heathen souls, it was because he had bared his own bosom first to those waters from on high and was filled with vernal powers for his life-long conflict with the bleak winter of German rationalism.

Conforming to these conditions made by God, the servant of Christ may confidently look to the Holy Spirit to nerve and to equip him for whatever duties and sufferings his calling may call forth. "What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." Mark 11: 24.

Considering the promises of Christ and our profound need of power from on high, it is marvellous that the Church at many places, is so barren, and that the equipment of the witnesses for Christ is frequently so insufficient. True whatever progress is made in any dirtction, whatever

faithful testimony is rendered, whatever in gathering of souls takes place, God's Spirit supplies the strength. But whatever failures we meet with, whatever barrenness saddens our heart, whatever weakness incapacitates us for large attempts and successes, is testimony of an insufficiency of that equipment, for which there is no substitute.

Missions are established, institutions founded, offices created for the purpose of extending the domain of the Holy Spirit. O for praying hearts and consecrated minds, O for thinking souls so completely under the direction of God's Spirit that it is He who, through us, establishes missions, founds institutions, creates offices, proclaims the Gospel. There would be a larger outpouring of blessings upon the Church, more peace in our midst, more unity and forbearance, and less of the evils that cause schism, alienation and defeat. "My strength is sufficient for thee," says the Lord. Nothing less than that should be sufficient for us.

THE APOLOGETICAL CHARACTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

One of the good features among the many bad in the modern methods if Biblical research and criticism, is the emphasis placed upon the historical side of the Bible. It is more and more recognized that the books of the Scriptures are not collections of abstract teachings, with theoretical purposes and academic objects, but stand in the closest possible connection with the history of the people of God and can find their explanation and interpretation, at least in many details and particulars, only in view of this historical bookground. As a rule, the books of the Bible are best understood when seen in the surroundings and influences of time and place that gave them birth. In those cases where this historical background can not be definitely determined, more or less difficulty results, as is e. g. the case with the book of Job and many of the Psalms. If the bulk

of the latter are the product of the Maccabean period, as is now generally claimed, their religious teachings will be less significant, than they are if David and his contemporaries wrote these lyrics. Zahn regards the Epistle of James as the earliest among the New Testament letters and accordingly draws a different picture of primitive Christianity from that outlined by those who consider this one of the latest or the last of this group of literature. Modern criticism considers the Levitical law in the middle books of the Pentateuch as chiefly the product of the post-exilic period. For these men this law is substantially a more or less natural result of the historical development of Israel's religion, while for him who places this Law at the beginning of Israel's career as a nation, it has an altogether deeper significance, being not the fruit and outcome, but the source, fountain head and controlling factor and force in this history. True it is, that this historical factor has not and cannot have the same value for each and every book of the Bible. The contents of the Scriptures as such are the record of an historical process, namely the history of redemption, the unfolding of God's plan for the salvation of mankind, and each single book does not stand in the same close connection with the outward phases and stages of this development that other books may. The Wisdom literature of the Old Testament is to a much greater degree an abstract class of writings than the prophetical books are, and for this reason can also be more readily understood without a knowledge of this historical background. But there is not a single book in the New Testament and perhaps not in the Old, which is so entirely independent of the circumstances of time and place and historical influences as are such abstract works as many of Plato's dialogues or Kant's "Kritik." It would be practically impossible to interpret the gospels without a knowledge of this historical background. Renan's word, that Palestine is a "fifth gospel" is substantially true. Classical works on Biblical interpretation, like Thomson's "Land and the Book" show to what a remarkable degree this factor plays an important role in the details of Biblical exegesis. Naturally,

of course, this principle and aid to interpretation can be overestimated, and the tendency now, when the purely literary side of the Scriptures is made unduly prominent, even at the expense of their revealed contents, is to put too high an estimate on these historical elements. So called "Oriental Sight Lights," facts and data taken from Cuneiform and hieroglyphic sources, from the literatures unearthed in the Nile and Tigris and Euphrates lands, are often regarded as the chief fundamental factors in the explanation of the Bible, a policy that is much favored by the naturalistic tendencies of technical learning in general. But the sober fact remains that the real contents of the Scriptures are the work of the Spirit, are a revelation and hence independent of any ordinary historical influence. The latter has affected only the form and the shape in which this revelation has been given, and although it sheds much light in many places on individual details of interpretation can practically do little and in most cases nothing in reference to what is the heart and kernel of revelation. What possible information could we get from historical influences on the teachings of the Word concerning the Trinity, the Person and the Work of Christ, the Atonement, Justification, Sanctification and kindred fundamentals of faith? None, whatever, although the historical background may shed light on the peculiar way in which even these fundamentals are revealed. The Epistle to the Romans is an example of this fact. It is readily recognized that the great Pauline argument for justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law is rather negatively than positively given in this writing, the point being directed against the idea that such a thing as justification by works is a possibility at all. An exact knowledge of the official theology of the Judaism of the day and the Judaistic tendencies in the early Christian church makes it clear why the Apostle selected this more negative way of presenting the central doctrine of the Christian system.

This feature of the historical background of Romans shows to what an extent not a few of the writings in the Bible are of an apologetical character. There is an undercurrent

of defense against false teachings and false ideas. This is particularly the case with the New Testament writings, as is almost a matter of course. Christianity came conquering and to conquer. It came with an avowed programme of supplanting all other religious creeds and types of moral teachings. It was not syncretistical and willing to recognize the rights of other religions by its side. In this regard it did not harmonize with the general religious tendencies of the religions of the time outside of Judaism. The latter too claimed to be the only true religion, but the creeds of the Roman Empire would have been willing to admit Christianity into its family of religions, if Christianity had been willing to be content to be one of many religions and not to be the only one. Naturally this attitude of the new religion aroused the antagonism of the existing religions and their organ, the state; and this fact explains why Christianity had to submit to persecutions which were not inflicted on other religions. Nothing else but a life and death struggle could ensue between Christianity and its rivals, and as a consequence the protagonists of Christianity were constantly compelled to defend their creed against the advocates of Judaism and of the Gentile religions. Christ's preaching was typical in this regard. His attitude on the Sabbath question, on justification and kindred fundamentals He was ever compelled to defend against Jewish criticism and misinterpretation. The entire fourth gospel is a series of debates between the Lord and the "Jews" with reference to His person and His relation to the Father.. In the Gospels this apologetical interest appears in the entire composition and purpose of the various books, although not to the same extent in each. In selecting from the doings and sayings of Jesus those things which the different gospel writers picked out, the principle of selection to a great extent was based on some point of defense of the new creed. The great debatable ground between Christianity and Judaism, then and now, has been the question, whether Jesus of Nazareth was really the Messiah who had been promised by the Prophets and Seers of the Old Testament. This Christ and His disciples

and Christianity at all times have persistently maintained and Judaism has just as persistently denied. The defense of the position of Christianity on this point is really the historical background and the chief motive and purpose of the gospel of St. Matthew. It is an apology of the Christian position on the basis of the facts of Christ's life when compared with the promises in the Old Testament. This explains the multitude of citations from the Old Testament found in Matthrew, each one going to prove that a certain fact in the career or work of Jesus of Nazareth was really the fulfillment of a promise made by the Old Testament writers. In Mark the apologetic tendency is not so clearly apparent, but it is nevertheless there, and is indicated by the very first verse of the book. Christianity stands and falls with the divine character of its Founder. If He is God, then Christianity is divine; if He is only moral and human then the religion He came to establish is not of God. The purpose of Mark is to furnish the proof for the divine character of Christ especially by giving the evidence through His victory over the kingdom of Satan, for nowhere else do we find so many accounts of the expulsion of Satan from demoniacs as we do in the second gospel. Luke's gospel, as appears from the dedicatory introduction to Theophilus, is to furnish an objective and truthful presentation of the founding of Christianity over against any unsatisfactory feature that other records, written in great numbers at that time already, may have contained. It is substantially an apologetical account of the actual genesis and earthly development of Christianity on the basis of what eyewitnesses and authoritative sources have reported. Its apologetical interest lies in its defense against unhistorical reports. The apologetical interests in John's gospel are apparent in almost every verse. Practically the entire book is a running controversy on the Christology of the Church, the divine character of Jesus and His work, His equality with the Father, His preexistence and kindled matters of essential importance for the Church and her creed. In the Pauline letters the apologetican concerns of the writer are generally clear at once. Men-

tion has already been made of the Epistle to the Romans, which stands as a monumental defence of the cardinal and formal principle of Christianity against the fundamental error of justification by works that lay embedded in the very soul of New Testament Judaism and indeed constituted its very life principle. Paul was compelled to defend this truth against the opposing error in his day as much as the revival of this Pauline principle by the Church of the Reformation has called for a constant defense of it against the false position and misinterpretation of the Roman Catholic church. It is interesting in this connection to note that the continual objections raised by Romanists against the Evangelical doctrine, namely that it promotes a sinful life, is nothing but a repetition of the opposition against which Paul had to contend, when he argues that the free pardon of sin through God's grace does not encourage Christians to sin, in order that thereby God's grace may abound all the more. The Epistles to the Corinthians are almost throughout practical letters purposing to correct abuses in the creed and life of the Corinthians, and are congregational writings in the highest sense of the term. Everywhere, on such fundamentals too as the resurrection of the body and the Lord's Supper, the Apostle is called upon to defend the genuine Christian teachings in word and deed, and to demonstrate over against error and misapplication what the true teachings and the fruits of the spirit are. Christian principles had been sorely and sadly abused in the Corinthian congregation, and it was the purpose of the Apostle to substitute for this abuse the true spirit of the Gospel. In his brilliant defense of the resurrection of the dead the Apostle furnishes a fine example of the apologetical character of his writings. His splendid exposition of the Lord's Supper was given only in opposition to the abuse as practiced in Corinth. Indeed almost the entire positive contents of these letters have an apologetical origin and cause and purpose. In Galatians the apologetical interests of the Apostle are probably more pronounced than in any other writing from his pen. His apostolic authority had been attacked by Judaizing teachers

for the very reason that he had taught that men are justified by faith and not by works. As a consequence the personal element in Galatians is more pronounced than in any other of the Pauline letters; but the defense of his apostolic authority is anything but personal; it is a defense of the doctrine of which he is the leading exponent. The Epistle to the Galatians is substantially an apology of the Apostle and his doctrine. The other letters of Paul, especially the Pastoral, show, when closely studied, how strong the apologetical element in each one is. At all stages and steps the protagonists of Christianity were called upon to defend their position against misinterpretation, falsification, philosophy falsely so called, Judaistic tendencies and the like, and this character of the majority of the New Testament books forms to a greater or less degree an undercurrent everywhere in these writings. If we knew better the entire historical background of the New Testament and the occasion and cause of the writing of many of these books, no doubt the general apologetical interest of the writers would appear all the clearer. In some cases, as, e. g., the Apocalypse of St. John, our ignorance in these matters is doubtlessly a leading reason why this book baffles all attempts at explanation. There seems to be no reason for doubting that the more clearly we understand the views and religious teachings which the New Testament books were largely intended to meet and over against which they are to furnish the apology and positive truths of Christianity, the better we will be able to understand these books themselves. Here is a factor with which Biblical Hermeneutics must deal more closely than they have heretofore, but with which they could not be expected to deal until the true importance of the historical principle of interpretation had been learned. The only great question is now, whether Biblical Exegesis will ever command all the facts that it needs to apply this principle consistently and fully. History, Archæology and the study of contemporaneous literature has done much in this direction; but little more than a good beginning has been made. Data and facts are now what is needed for this work.

Quite naturally the books of the Old Testament cannot and do not possess this same apologetic interest and concern. The Old Testament covenant was not developed as the New was, in constant contrast and touch with other creeds and religions. Its principle was separation and segregation, and whatever influence foreign religions exercised on its internal development was contrary to the wishes of the Lord. Whatever apologetical interests the Old Testament writers purposed to subserve were directed only against corruption from within. One of the leading problems with which the Psalmists deal is the charge that the godly perish while the godless flourish. It was a doubt that naturally could originate in the circles of the adherents of the Theocracy. The grand Theodicy of the Book of Job, which makes this work one of the greatest products of the world's literature, deals largely with the same problem. True, some phases of the idolatry worship of Israël, such as the belief in national and local gods with equal jurisdiction and power each in his own precincts, are an importation from kindred nations around Isreal; but against this and similar errors the Old Testament writers seldom argue *ex professo,* the error being regarded as self-evident, one that required only to be mentioned but scarcely disproved. Had Israel mingled and mixed more with surrounding nations then the defensive element would doubtless have been a more pronounced feature of the Old Testament books; but the universality of the New Testament covenant over against the particularity of that of the Old Testament, made it a matter of course that the New Testament books should partake more of this character.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

PROFESSOR THEO. MEES, PH. D., Columbus, O.

III.

Having outlined in the preceding article, how the three divisions with their parallel classes may be profitably employed in preparation for the final instruction by the pastor, I shall now briefly sketch the *methodical* treatment of this material, in order to exhibit, why the Bible histories are so eminently useful to quicken the understanding of children and aid them in comprehending and assimilating religious doctrines.

Omitting as far as possible all technical terms, it can be said, that on the basis of sound pedagogical principles the child will be conducted from the first moment to the final result through five distinct steps, which shall be designated by Roman figures, as follows:

I. *Preparation.* This step purposes to create concepts, or ideas, in the child's soul, which will serve as points of contact for the new matter; e. g., reference to histories already discussed; personal experience of the child, etc. This leads to the establishment of the *aim,* which may be formulated by the teacher, or may be found by the pupil; e. g., "What would you now expect to occur?" or, "What further would you like to learn about this matter?"

II. *Presentation.* This step embraces two distinct activities: A) *narrative,* and B) *discussion.*

A. In the Primary Division the teacher will relate the facts of the history in a simple manner adapted to the understanding of the child. All unessentials must be omitted and only short sections narrated at one time, from which suitable captions are formulated and repeated by the pupils. Important sentences, or quotations, are repeated verbatim. In the Intermediate and Advanced Divisions the histories will be read from the respective books.

B. The *discussion* again comprises two distinct attivities: a) the *discussion of the facts,* and b) *direction of*

judgment. The former seeks to develop the logical connection between the facts in their historical order, the latter aims to open the child-mind to apprehend the omnipotence, wisdom and grace of God; His wonderful counsels in the direction of the affairs of men; the knowledge of sin and its consequences; the ideas of obedience, faith, hope, truth, piety, godliness, etc. The child must learn to see all this objectively in order to apply it subjectively; it must be made to identify itself in a measure with the person of history and thus find the motives and their connection with subsequent events.

III. *Association and Comparison.* The purpose here is to show the *truth* or *doctrine* resulting from B. b. to be of *general validity* as exemplified by other histories, personal experience and whatever other material may be at hand. Truths which have been found from the concrete examples are to be made applicable to all similar situations, hence *abstract knowledge* will result from such generalization. The child must be directed to discover this association by bringing other histories, etc., with their content into comparison with the one under discussion.

With quite young children this step will be limited in its application, but after the second year a great mass of material will be at hand for such concentration and review.

IV. *Generalization.* The preceding steps will at once culminate in the fixing of the truth or doctrine in the form of a *Bible passage,* a catechism sentence or a hymn-verse, or all three. These will naturally *grow out* of the history and illustrate it. In this manner the abstract doctrine is conceived by the child as a property, cause, effect, etc., of the concrete person, circumstance, event, etc.

V. *Application.* This step is the crowning point of all the preceding work. The children are to become conscious of the fact, that all that God did once, He continues to do now; that as He has guided others in times past, so He now guides and directs also them; how He punished evil, rewarded godliness, He still does so now. Their own thoughts, their emotions, their volitions must be directed

by the lesson learned. It is the examination of self, reflection and decision in the light of the history, which is the final aim of the lesson. Thus the abstract truth of the history as developed previously again becomes concrete in the personal relations of the pupil.

If picture charts are acecssible, their proper use will be supplementary to the above, as restful stimulants to the imagination and means of a mental photography. It may be remarked, that the design is not slavishly to follow in every lesson these five steps, so that each would represent a definite unit. In actual work the line of division will hardly be noticed, but the logical order of thought, the successive advance from one to the next must be there. The steps may merge into one another, but they will never be substituted one for the other. No pattern-work is asked, but logical order of treatment, As a *system* for the preparation of the lesson by the teacher, they are fundamental and should be well understood and faithfully practiced.

Summarized, the following will be the order:

I. Preparation—Formation of concept masses which will assist the apperception of the new material. Fixing of the *aim*.

II. Presentation —
- A. Narration.
- B. Discussion.
  - a. Of facts.
  - b. Of judgments derived.

III. Association and comparison.

IV. Generalization.

V. Application.
- a. To the pupil.
- b. To other circumstances and relations of life.

In the subjoined lesson the principles outlined above are applied in a practical exercise, which the pastor conducts after the history has been related or read and the Bible verses and catechism questions have been rehearsed. The history is the last of the St. John cycle, relating his death as re-

corded Matt. 14, 1-12, and St. Mark 6, 14 ff. The verses learned are: I, Rev. 12, 10; II, Matt. 5, 10; III, Matt. 10, 23. Review: 5th, 6th and 2d commandments, which have been learned in connection with former histories. The numerals refer to the summary above, the narrative (or reading) being omitted.

I. Dear children: For several Sundays past we have heard of a man who lived and preached at the time of our Savior, what is his name? In what part of the country did he preach? At that time many people went out to him about the Jordan, what did he preach to them all? What does this mean — *repentance?* Why did the people need this What verse did we learn, which teaches this, Ps. 19, 12? "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults." I wonder, if all people were pleased with his preaching to repentance; who probably were not pleased? On last Sunday we heard, that notwithstanding such opposition John continued to preach; whose way should he prepare? By whose command was he to do this? But if the King of the land had come, John probably would have been afraid to preach in this way to him, what do you think? And why should he not hesitate to preach repentance even to a King?

This indeed did occur; for at one time he was called upon to preach just this repentance to a King; to-day you have heard —

AIM: *How this faithfulness of John led to his death.*

II.-B. a. (On first section.)

Who was King at that time in Judea? (Yes, he was the son of the Herod to whom the wise men of the East had come at the time of Christ's birth.) What opinion did he have of John? How did he show this? What was the name of Herod's wife? Whose wife had she been before? For this wickedness John reprimanded him, in what words? What revenge did Herod take for this bold speech? Whose anger against John was still greater than Herod's? What did she desire should be done to John? But why did Herod not grant her wish?

We learn from this, how faithful John was to the Lord's command. What have we learned now?

B. a (On second section.)

But Herodias did not forget her quarrel, i. e., her anger and spite against John, and only waited for an opportunity to satisfy it, and how this came about you may now tell me.

Herod made a great supper, on which occasion? Who were present at that supper? He no doubt wished to entertain them well, what was one entertainment provided for the guests? How did this dance please Herod? From what act can you know this? What did he add, to make his promise sure? Herod probably thought, that the girl would ask for something very pretty, jewels or the like, and perhaps she wished for just such things; but what led her not to ask for these? What did her mother advise her to ask? Why did the mother give this horrible advice? How did Herod feel about this request? Why did he not refuse at once to grant it? What then was done to John? To whom did the damsel bring his bloody head? What, however, was done with his body?

II-B. b. Why did the severe reproof of John, because Herod had taken his brother's wife, anger the King? Against which commandment did both Herod and Herodias sin? To what should John's reproof have led Herod? Instead of this he commits a *second* sin from pleasure in the maiden's dance. How does he confirm his promise? (When one swears, he calls upon God to witness the truth, and to punish, when the promise is broken.) Why was it wrong in Herod to swear to his promise? This promise was thoughtless and the oath still more so. In which commandment are we forbidden to swear by God's name? Now on hearing the request of the damsel, we should think, that Herod would remember the reproof of John, what should he have answered the girl? Instead of this he commits a *third* great sin, which? Against which commandment did he sin now? Who was just as guilty of John's murder, as Herod himself? Why? What sin did they also commit? You see, when one begins to sin, he continues to sin more and more; unless

he repent at once. What did you learn about this in the verse 2 Tim 3, 13: "But evil men and sinners shall wax more and more, deceiving and being deceived?"

III. How differently did a pious youth act, whom at one time a wicked woman in Egypt wished to tempt to sin? Who remembers his name? What answer did *Joseph* give, when Potiphar's wife asked him to sin? ("How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?") What answer should Herod have given to the damsel's request? How did God show his pleasure in Joseph's obedience to his commandment? Herod, on the other hand, received his just punishment; he was banished and died in a strange country.

You have also heard of a prophet of God, who preached repentance to a wicked king and the priests of Baal, who was this man? What dreadful punishment was visited upon the priests of Baal, because they would not repent? How did God show his pleasure in the fearless faithfulness of Elijah? What then can we confidently hope as to John, though he was murdered?

IV. Such faithfulness in His service God requires from all His children, even unto death. Who can repeat a little verse, in which this is taught? Rev. 2. 10: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." And in which verse does He call them blessed, that suffer for righteousness' sake? Matt. 5, 10: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for their's is the Kingdom of heaven." And which glorious promise does He give to them, that confess Him before men? Matt. 10, 32: "Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven."

Yes, our Lord and Savior will acknowledge us as his dear children.

V. Which, do you think, had chosen the better part, Herod or John? Why do you think so? Whom then should we take as an example? In which thing should we seek to imitate him? In what respect does this verse apply here: "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin"? But to what end should the example

of Herod serve us? He feared men more than he feared God, what would God have *us* do? How does this verse apply here? "We ought to obey God rather than men?" Now, tell me again ,against which commandments Herod sinned especially? Of these the *second* commandment is one, against which young people sin so recklessly. When one says, to make others believe him: *I hope to die!* how is this sinning against this commandment? (Other instances.) For what shall we use God's name? (Repeat explanation of *second* command.)

When we thus observe God's will He will bless us and guard us against other sins. Repeat once more together the beautiful verse, Rev. 2, 10.

Always pray this verse, when sin tempts you, and God will watch over you and keep you from harm. Amen.

A careful analysis of this lesson will show, I believe, how the whole school can be interested and instructed, after having heard or read the history, having been asked to repeat the salient facts, and having carefully memorized and recited the Scripture verses, catechism passages or hymns. There are questions which are simple enough for the little ones and deep enough to set the older to thinking. All have learned at least *one* verse which applies directly to the matter discussed, all must be alert always; every one takes home one great spiritual truth, one valuable maxim for life. It appears also, how in the course of a year the most valuable matter fill be reviewed again and again, always from a changing point of view, under a different illumination, in a new connection with new application. That is the great secret of permanently fixing in the soul truths as living principles.

The objection might be urged, that the preparation of a catechesis on the lines of the above lesson cannot well be asked of a pastor with his many other Sunday duties, and that probably a minority only could acquire the technical skill successfully to construct such a lesson. In order to meet both objections, a word more may be permitted.

If in accordance with the plan so far set forth the *best* results should be attained, the necessary helps would require: *First*, a series of Bible Histories, Primary, Intermediate and Advanced, arranged according to the same fundamental principles, i. e., the biographical method in complete cycles. E. g., *Creation cycle,* embracing four histories, with the "aim" as caption, and memory matter below the text. Thus:

1. How God created heaven and earth.
   - I. Gen. 1, 1.
   - II. Ps. 115, 3.
   - III. Catechism, 1. Article.
     Hymn No. 167, 1-3.
2. How God created the first man.
   - I. Gen. 1, 27.
   - II. Gen. 1, 26.
   - III. 1. Article (explanation.)
     Hymn No. 115, 1.
3. How sin came into the world.
   (Three sections.)
   1. The command.
   2. The sin.
   3. The punishment.
      - I. 1 John 3, 4.
      - II. Prov. 14, 34.
      - III. Rom. 5, 12. Catechism ques. 111.
4. How Cain murdered his brother Abel.
   (Two sections.)
   1. The murder.
   2. The punishment.
      - I. 1 John 3, 15.
      - II. John 8, 34.
      - III. Matt. 5, 21. 22. Fifth commandment.

Noah cycle, Abraham cycle, Isaac cycle, and so on.

Second. A Teachers' Manual with complete treatment of every history, as illustrated in the lesson above. This would secure a valuable guide for all times and supplant the

"Annual" with its recurrent expense. Furthermore I believe our parochial teachers would welcome such a work for their classes.

In conclusion, I would suggest, that the Bible Class, composed of confirmed members, complete the study of the Bible by supplying the missing links of the preceding course, a brief history of the Church, and a simple exposition of the principal confessions of our Church. With God's blessing such instruction would serve to fortify our dear youth against error and other mischievous influences, secure for them a sound knowledge of that most holy treasure, our Bible, indoctrinate them in the fundamental principles of our faith, and imbue them with love and veneration for the Church of their fathers.

THE THOROUGH PREPARATION FOR THE CATECHETICAL CLASS.

BY REV. F. W. ABICHT, A. B., MARYSVILLE, OHIO.

That the man before the catechetical class should be thoroughly well acquainted with the safe and sound principles of Empirical Psychology and a close student of human nature, knowing especially the natures of the children before him; that he should be conversant with the methods of Pedagogy and at least somewhat adept in the skillful application of them, something of a school *master;* that he should be versed and schooled in that very important branch of Practical Theology, Catechetics, and have made a more than passing acquaintance with the great masters in this science and art, if you please; that he should well know and have digested his subject matter, especially Luther's Smaller Catechism and the one or the other of the "explanations" of the same: this has been briefly sketched in a previous article. These things are fundamental. It will, perhaps, be helpful to sketch a few vital characteristics of the catechization itself, to expatiate briefly on the special preparation for the catechetical class.

The reader will, however, please remember the fact that the writer is compelled to confine himself to the limits of an ordinary article. Some of the things which are so readily overlooked or left unheeded and which are so important shall be dwelt upon in as summary a manner as possible.

II. THE SPECIAL PREPARATION.

Catechization may embrace within its scope any instruction or teaching according to the dialogue plan or question and answer method. Usually the term is confined to religious teaching by means of questions and answers. Portions of Holy Writ, notably some of the Psalms, Bible Histories, the more important Church hymns, portions of Church History, like the Life of Luther, and even the current liturgical forms, may be and are most fitly taught by the catechetical method. The catechization, however, which takes place in the catechetical class, preparatory to the sacred rite of Confirmation, of necessity usually confines itself to teaching the Five Chief Parts of Christian doctrine, or Luther's Catechism, although it frequently reaches out beyond these confines and makes the religious matters alluded to part and parcel of the teaching. The writer wishes to confine himself to the strict sense of the term; what disposition is to be made of those other religious materials will appear subsequently.

1. The first thing to be done in preparing a catechization is to make clear the words of Luther's Small Catechism. These after all form the text. Lindemann: "It is necessary to proceed from the text of the Catechism and continually to return to the same." The catechumen has (or is supposed to have) committed to memory these words, and it is now the catechist's plain duty to lead the pupil to understand their meaning. It has often been found that a certain amount of explanation is well placed before the memorizing, particularly when otherwise a wrong conception is obviously probable, but the greater part, of course, succeeds it. But the text must be made plain. *Luther:*

"Teach them, first of all, the text of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, etc., so that they can say it after you word for word, and commit it to memory.

Secondly, when they have well learned the text, teach them the sense also, that they may know what it means." Lindemann in his *Schul-Praxis* very earnestly and emphatically declares it as of prime importance that all catechization should first seek "to make the contents of Luther's Small Catechism clear and dear to our pupils," and that every treatment of it which has not this end in view, "must be declared as a failure from the very outset." Rambach in his small but splendid little book on the subject writes: "Forasmuch as these (the words of Luther's Catechism) are composed with great wisdom, taken from the Scriptures and must be regarded as veritable masterpieces of the sainted man, therefore they are appropriately used as a basis in the catechization." This cannot be otherwise, for these words are a terse compendium of Christian truth, compact, concise, and teeming with thought and life. Moreover, these words are words of religious language, a tongue of its own kind, adapted to a special purpose. Their meaning must be made plain.

This applies not merely to individual difficult and unusual words. These, of course, are included, but are not the only ones needing explanation. It is necessary to show, for instance, what "covet" means; but quite as necessary to point out the obvious purpose of God in using the singular "thou" instead of the plural "ye." Again, taking the First Commandment as an example, the pupil dare not get or keep the impression that there really are "other gods." "*Having* other gods," imagining that there are such, or treating creatures as if they were such, is the plain implication. There is a literal sense and a logical sense in words. Here sometimes the former must be explained, the latter always. From *"Was sagen die Worte?"* by Prof. F. Lindemann the writer begs leave to cite and translate a series of explanations, as found under the head of the First Commandment: *"Thou,"* each individual human being, *"shalt*

not," irrevocable will and ablsolute demand of *God,* who has the *right* to command, and the *power* to punish. His demands abide and *must* be complied with. *"Other gods,"* idols. *Gods* not because they *are* such, but are so *regarded. "Have,"* to *recognize* as God, to *regard,* to *honor,* to *worship. "Before me," with* me, *beside* me; hence to *have me alone.* — Luther: "That to which you cling and on which you rely, is really your God. To have a god, means to have something, in which the heart wholly trusts."—This will suffice for the present purpose, to show how the Catechism words can and ought to be explained.

The question now is, how best to handle such explanation. It might seem, as if quite a little interspersed lecturing were necessary. But the regulation catechetical method must be employed, and the catechumen led to discover for himself the meaning of the words and phrases. Previous to proceeding to the individual commandments, there has been explained, why we say: the *Holy* Ten Commandments, namely because the Holy God gave them. Then comes the introduction to all the Commandments: I am the Lord, thy God. We can now proceed about as follows. Who speaks these words? God speaks these words. What does He declare Himself to be? He declares Himself as the Lord. What right has He as the Lord? He has the right to rule over us. What has He the right to tell us? He has the right to tell us what to do and what to shun. What has He the power to do with those who disobey His commandments? He has the right to punish the disobedient. Whom does He address by the word "Thou"? He addresses man by the word "Thou". Does He speak to mankind as a whole (collectively), or to each one by himself (individually)? He speaks to each one by himself. From what word do we plainly learn this? We learn this from the word "Thou". What does He say in the First Commandment to each one of us? He says, Thou shalt have no other gods before me. The word *shalt* indicates how earnestly He demands of each one of us to have no other gods: what does God urgently demand of each human being? He

demands that each one have no other gods. Are there really other gods, besides the Lord, the true God? There are no other gods. But what do men regard or have as God? They regard things as God which are not God. What honor do they give to the things which they regard as God? They give them the honor which belongs to God. For example, what honor did the children of Israel give to the golden calf? They worshiped the golden calf. Whom alone should we pray to or worship? We should worship God alone. What dare we not worship before Him, or with and besides Him? We dare not worship anything besides Him.—In this way the sense of Luther's words in the Catechism may be made plain to the catechumen, before proceeding to explain or unfold the implied details, and the Scripture sources and proof texts of them. It might be called the method of substituting words and phrases, whose meaning is evident, for words and phrases which are not so plain. A very brief and inexpensive little help in this may be found in Prof. F. Lindemann's *"Was sagen die Worte?"* But the matter offered therein should be converted into questions and answers, remarks by the catechist being interspersed only now and then, where the other method is not practicable, and that as briefly as possible.

Wherever, as in the Ten Commandments, the words of the Catechism are themselves Scripture words, it is well to proceed directly from these to the consideration of the Scripture passages, which form the source of Luther's explanation in answer to the oft repeated "What does this mean?" that is to say, the synthetic method of using these passages as a source, rather than the analytic method of using them as proof passages, is to be preferred. In the latter method the procedure is from the Commandment to Luther's explanation, from this to the further explanation and then to the passages. But whichever method is employed, the use and application of these passages is of the utmost importance.

2. If we take a look at a Roman Catholic Catechism, we at once notice that there are no Scripture passages. This is not surprising, since the Holy Bible is only *one* of the sources of revealed truth to a true Papist; besides, it is to him not a very important source at that. We are not claiming too much by saying, that it is *only nominally one* of the sources of faith and rules of life. The flippant use of Scripture passages in that camp plainly shows this. But in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the true Church of the Reformation, the Holy Scriptures, interpreted by themselves, are the only source of faith, the only rule of life. This is evident also from a simple glance at the Catechism of this church. This little book is so precious to a Lutheran, because it is God's Word. It is not merely conform to the Scriptures, but is itself a compendium of Scripture truth unto salvation. And this it is that must be made evident to the catechumen. Again and again should it be made clear and emphasized that the Catechism is used to teach God's pure Word, without adding thereto or taking therefrom. But the catechization is a failure every time, when the subject matter is not clearly shown to be God's Word. When the catechumen knows the words of Luther's Catechism and understands their simple meaning, one of two things must be done: either by the use of the synthetical method he must see that the Scriptures are the only source of the truths taught, or by the analytical method he must see that the Scriptures prove and substantiate the undoubtable truth of Luther's teaching; or, still better, by the analytic-synthetic method both ends are attained.

It is a matter of dispute, which one of these methods is the best. To discuss their merits and demerits, lies beyond the scope of this article. There are among us strenuous advocates of all of them; the difficult, complicated, analytic-synthetic method of Herbart-Ziller, with its noted five *Formal Stufen* has its ardent admirers especially among our parochial teachers, though comparatively few find it so easy and practicable to follow and use it. Lindemann in his Schul-Praxis, has this to say: The synthetic way is much

more difficult than the analytic, and none but a very experienced catechist can follow it and reach the goal without stumbling or even breaking his legs. For the school the analytic way is the most appropriate way, the shortest and safest. Teachers and scholars, by pursuing the analytic method, know exactly where they are going and how far they have gone, and the visible text before them is a guiding staff in their hands and keeps them from slipping and falling." p. 130. With this Schuetze does not agree, when he writes: "Some text-books describe the two methods as being absolutely separate. In reality their relation to one another in the catechization is reciprocal, so that a well-executed analysis includes synthesis, and vice versa, there is no synthesis without analysis. The evangelical catechization is not purely analytic nor purely synthetic, but by the very nature of its material, it is analytic-synthetic. The inseparableness of the two methods is ingeniously expressed by Goethe: 'Analysis and Synthesis both constitute, like inhaling and exhaling, the life of science.'" Catechetics, p. 130. For classes having a good parochial school training as a foundation to work on, the synthetic method alone or the analytic-synthetic method are undoubtedly better than the same would be for such classes, as the average pastor in our English congregations have to handle. While the writer would despair of using any other than the analytic method in such classes, he has found it quite practicable to use the synthetic alone or the combined method in his classes here, in which every member has been in the parochial school. The reader will notice that Lindemann does not disparage the use of synthesis, but prefers analysis *"for the school."* For other than scholars from the church school, almost any method will be found difficult, for the reason that teaching by carefully put questions and answers is a thing most children have not become accustomed to in the schools they attended. But enough, whatever method is followed, the use of the Scripture passages in the Catechism and in the catechization must ever be the same in a few essential points.

That the Scripture passages as sources and ultimately as proofs must be the only sources and proofs is almost too evident to even receive a mention in this connection. But how easily the catechist is tempted to adduce proofs from reason also, every one knows. One is tempted, for instance, to add analogies of a very unsatisfactory kind to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, when even the mere illustration of it from such analogies is only too apt to make the wrong impression that this is to prove in part the truth of it. Examples of this kind limp and halt. That the Bible is God's Word and that it is all-sufficient for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, must be taught and exemplified in the very treatment of it. On this point Lindemann says: "It is utterly wrong and most decidedly harmful to try to evolve doctrines of faith from reason, to seek to make them plausible to reason, to prove them by reason, or to treat them at all in a philosophical way. The Gospel is the only source of all saving revelation, and the only foundation of faith must always be: It is written! "To adduce proofs from reason and human science or experience, is the way of the Rationalists and Fanatics, cannot be termed Evangelical Lutheran, and is a denial of the true Protestant principle that God's Word is all-sufficient as the source of doctrine and the rule of life. We have before us the Scripture passages; we must now make them available for our purpose, evolve the doctrine from them, or prove it by them, as the case may be.

The catechist is not put to the arduous task of selecting his own Bible passages; he has such a selection before him, carefully made. Does any one doubt this of our own little text-book, which is based on the incomparable Dietrich, and which was prepared by critical master minds? Nevertheless, it should by careful study have become the catechist's unwavering conviction that the passages strike the spot, that they prove what they are meant to prove. Don't misapply. Find the connection, and rather ignore a passage selected by some one else than to use it, when

the ground of its selection is not clear. It will not harm in the least, if at times a passage or two is added to those in the text-book, and if the catechumens are required to look them up in their Bibles. Our German magazine has been offering a splendid help by an extended series of articles from a master-pen, which unfold the sense of the Scripture passages in our Catechism and show the connection between them and the catechetical statements. These articles will not directly furnish prepared material for the lessons, but will do so indirectly and will aid the catechist in that important matter of being sure of his ground, so that he can proceed, and that with a good conscience, to the preparation of this material for the class.

Lucid, brief explanation is indispensable in many passages; some are quite clear as they stand and the child can pick them out for a proof with little difficulty. But they are by no means all of that kind. Where the sense and connection is obvious, explanation is superfluous. "This is the true God and eternal life," 1 John 5, 20, is very clear; yet even here, to whom does "This" refer? Let the child open its Bible and see and be sure, that it refers to Christ, whose divinity is to be proven by it. Another example: "And God saw every thing that He had made, and behold, it was very good," Gen. 1, 31, is cited to prove that the image of God, in which man was created, consisted first, in the perfection of the whole man; it must be made plain that when God in His Word predicates "very good" of anything, it is perfect; (this is all the more necessary to explain, because this predicate is so frequently and wretchedly misused;) it must also be made plain that a perfect men, in so far as he is perfect, has the image of God. (The chief element of the divine image is "righteousness and holiness," proven by other passages.) The catechumen must be led to see the import of the Scripture passages, by skillfully placed questions as much as possible. Lecturing and preaching is not in place, and hence, the more difficult the passage, the clearer must the catechist make it in his own mind and the more pains must he take to find simple,

short, clear words and phrases to make it plain to the class. And this is a very important element in his preparation for the class.

The passages must be applied, after their sense is made clear. The catechist has either formulated a proposition in his own mind, toward which he is directing the contents of the passage, or he has evoked a proposition by questions, which is to be proven. The child must be led to state the proposition in mind, or point out the connection between a stated proposition and the passage, — according as the synthetic or analytic method is pursued. Without such application, the whole work of explaining passages and propositions is for naught. In some cases the child will readily find the connection, in others the teacher must himself point it out; in most cases, well-prepared questions will lead the child to discover the point, and this tends to delight and arouse attention. Let us take at random our question 163 for an example. It is easy enough to get the child to see that good angels are spirits from Heb. 1, 14; that they are holy and blessed spirits from Matt. 18, 10, because they could not always behold the face of the Father which is in heaven (be with Him in the abode of bliss), if they were not holy, and being in such close communion must make them blessed; that they ever praise Him from Ps. 103, 20, and that they fulfill His commands; that they protect the just (who shall be heirs of eternal salvation, who fear Him), from Heb. 1, 14; Ps. 34, 7. No interspersed lecturing should be at all necessary with children ripe for the catechetical class in such an easy portion. Questions properly formulated will almost invariably evoke the correct answers.

3. The province of illustration and of giving due attention to the sensibilities and will in the catechization is best provided for by a liberal use of the Bible Histories. There is such a vast storehouse of material here, that it seems almost impossible to make use of any more. The teaching is thus made concrete by examples from the Word of God itself. The heinousness of sin itself and the dread-

fulness of its consequences can be made to stand forth in bold relief by citing the numerous examples, described for our warning. What better example for the incipiency, progress and consummation of murder, for the fearful uneasiness of conscience and dreadful restlessness of the murderer, than that of Cain? What better illustration of the besetting sin of coveting and its outcome than that of David, of Ahab and Jezebel? Or what better example of a chaste and pure youth than that of Joseph, who feared to offend God by sinning, more than the consequence of resisting, evidently clearly before him in his mind? With the review of these examples are concommitant feelings and volitions averse to sin and for holiness, if the lessons of them are carefully and persistently driven home to the young hearts and consciences; if, after hatred and indignation has been aroused against sin, the Nathanic application is made: Thou art the man. Likewise, if Gospel truth is made concrete by the numerous evangelical histories, especially of Christ Himself, no better illustrations are extant and no better means offered to incite to faith in the love of God as it has become most clearly manifest in the Christ, the Son of God. These illustrations can indeed be supplemented by citations from such men's lives as that of Luther, but the examples from Holy Writ stand first and pre-eminently at the head of all of them. No catechization should be conducted without them, and because the time is limited, a careful selection of the most striking illustrations should be made, which serve at the same time as Scripture proofs and sources of divine truth.

As no sermon is complete without practical application, thus also no catechization. The pupil must be made to feel his own personal sinfulness. Scripture examples of sinful men dare not be so objectively handled, that the Pharisaical spirit has room to develop into the apparent thanksgiving to God that "I am not as other men are." It must be brought to bear on these young minds and hearts that "all these things happend unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition." Questions that probe the

conscience and heart must evoke the quiet assent or blush of shame, must show the incipient Cain within the pupils and the danger of frightful development. "He that hateth his brother is a murderer:" do you hate, become angry, jealous, envious; do you burst forth in angry, spiteful words? These so-called unpleasant questions must be made. They take hold of the feelings and lay the foundation for the volitions and acts we are after. — But evangelical truths may likewise be so treated. What a splendid thing that Luther in explaining the three articles, takes himself as the blessed recipient of so many immeasurable divine favors, and makes the Catechism pupils repeat it after him! It is not "we" and "us," much less "the human race," but "I" and "my" and "me." Full proof must be made of this splendid circumstance. Bring these great truths near and drive them into the heart, so that the great and blissful assurance may fill the child, that it is undeservedly the object of divine favor, grace and mercy, that to it as well as to any other is the legion of promises and offers. — And this can all very well be done by the ordinary method of questions and answers, the regulation catechétical method, which for effectiveness, if anyways properly handled, has no equal.

The writer cannot close this mere sketch of preparation duties and considerations without pleading for two things on the part of the catechist. Let him remember where he is about to go, that it is a sacred place, that he is to make that place God's house and the gate of heaven. Immortal souls of children, whose after life he is to shape to a large extent, are entrusted to his care. Can he offend them by a defective treatment of the lesson, by unfriendly and loveless demeanor? And what then for him? The Lord's dreadful verdict, Matt. 18, 6. Should not this great responsibility resting on him lay him low at the Master's feet in fervent prayer for enlightenment, guidance, love, patience and humility. There is nothing impossible to Him: He can supply out of the great bounty of His riches that which we lack and need. He can make the gloomy countenance beam with friendliness, yea, can make the cold heart burn

with faith and earnest zeal, and who will doubt, can supply in our teaching that which, somehow or other, all our zealous preparation has failed to bring us. "Without me ye can do nothing." He has promised His divine succor to all earnest applicants at His throne of grace. Prayer is an essential element in all thorough preparation, and he who neglects it at the important time when he is about to feed the Lord's lambs, has neglected the best part of his preparation.

"Ora et labora, et Deus aderit sine mora!"

CHRISTIAN OR EVANGELICAL LIBERTY.

BY REV. P. A. PETER, VERONA, OHIO.

(Concluded.)

Consideration for the Weak in the Exercise of Christian Liberty, Submission to Discipline and other Matters.

As clearly and decidedly as Luther expressed the principle of evangelical liberty, even so clearly and decidedly did he also express himself concerning the charitable and generous consideration for the weak in the faith, in the Christian's exercise of this liberty and in a voluntary submission to good order and discipline, by a self-denying restraint on the part of the strong believer. The great Reformer was always governed by the scriptural rule that although all things were lawful to the believer, yet not all things were expedient or profitable. The strong believer does not seek his own advantage or pleasure but charitably considering the weakness of some brethren, seeks their good. For himself, one strong in the faith will abstain from what will give offence to the weak, so that with the Apostle he can say, Wherefore, if meat makes my brother to offend (causeth my brother to stumble), I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend (to stumble). 1 Cor. 6, 12; 10, 23-33; 8, 13.

Luther's idea of Christian liberty and its proper use is expressed in Dr. Köstlin's Theology of Luther, Vol. II, p.

488, thus: "He" (the Christian) "is free in his conscience from the curse of sin and the law. He stands free, exalted in his conscience before God above all laws, since no appointed work is needed to secure his salvation and he is bound to no particular work, but all works that call for his attention are alike to him. He remains free, likewise, in his relations with his fellow-men — free in the service to which he devotes himself; free in his faith, in view of which no human ordinance can longer bind his conscience; free in the love which subjects itself to laws, yet at the same time remains the mistress enthroned above all laws."

How far the strong believer may sometimes yield to the weak, is seen in St. Paul's circumcising young Timothy. In order that this young disciple might labor acceptably among Jewish believers, as a helper of the Apostle, he circumcised him. Although Timothy's father, a Greek, permitted his son, when a child, to be instructed in the holy Scriptures by his Jewish mother and grandmother, it appears that he was not willing that Timothy should be circumcised. St. Paul, desirous of removing the national prejudices of the Jewish Christians of Lystra against Timothy, the uncircumcised son of a Gentile father, and in order to legitimize the young disciple in the eyes of Jewish believers, so that he might labor acceptably among them in preaching the Gospel, he circumcised him. In doing so, the Apostle did not by any means surrender his evangelical liberty. Without sacrificing that great principle, he yielded to circumstances, which he could not change. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. Gal. 5, 6; 6, 15.

When it became necessary to defend the great principle of evangelical liberty against the assault of Pharisaic legalists, the Apostle was unyielding. When he went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, an uncircumcised Greek, he was not afraid of the Judaizing teachers and did not yield to them. (Gal. 2, 3-5.) The same Apostle, who

had caused Timothy to be circumcised, that no offence might be given to weak, but sincere, Jewish Christians, would not circumcise the Gentile Titus to please the Pharisaic party, that said to the Gentile converts to Christianity: Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. (Acts 15, 1.)

The great Apostle's position on evangelical liberty is expressed by his words: For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. (1 Cor. 9, 19.) This is also Luther's position, as expressed in the saying, that although "the Christian is a free lord of all things and subject to no one," yet at the same time by love he "is servant to all things and subject to every one." As paradoxical as this may sound, it is nevertheless true when we consider the believer's relation to God "in a state of grace and justification, as a new, regenerate, and spiritual man" and then consider the believer as "being still in the world, and under the duties which his calling and condition of life impose upon him."

By true and living faith the believer is united to Christ, and by virtue of this union all that is Christ's is also the believer's. Hence he is free from the curse and condemnation of the moral law. And as Christ perfectly fulfilled all the ordinances of the Ceremonial law, which was a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ, (Col. 2, 17), the believer is not bound by these ordinances. "But as Christ took upon Himself the form of a servant to minister unto us, thus the Christian, being himself free from all works by faith, resigns his own liberty in order to do to his neighbor as Christ has done to himself."

The Christian should always keep in mind the rule laid down by the Apostles as expressed in Rom. 14, 7. and 1 Cor. 6, 19. 20. For none of us liveth to himself. We are not our own but the Lord's. Now if we are the Lord's we should certainly imitate him in serving our neighbor in love. "For the Christian does not live in himself but in Christ and in the brethren; in Christ by faith, in his fellowman by love. By faith he soars upward to God, by love

he stoops to his fellow-man." (See the article Freedom, Christian, Evangelical, in the Luth. Cyclopedia by Jacobs and Haas, p. 186.)

In the use or exercise of evangelical freedom, the Christian should charitably consider the weak in the faith and submit to good order and discipline, not unwillingly by constraint, but voluntarily and cheerfully. They who are strong in the faith should receive and acknowledge the weak as fellow-believers in Christ, although weak and timid Christians may not be well qualified to decide anything in "doubtful disputations" on questions concerning Christian freedom, or in deciding on personal scruples in matters concerning evangelical liberty. (Rom. 14, 1.) We should act charitably toward the weak and timid, and not cause offence in exercising our liberty. Very often it is better to refrain from the use of that which is not prohibited by divine command in things called *adiaphora,* than to exercise our freedom. We should so live and act that our good may not be evil spoken of (Rom. 14, 14-19.; chap. 15, 1-3). Above all, evangelical liberty must not become a cloak to conceal wickedness. (1 Peter 2, 16.)

True, Christian liberty, the freedom of the Gospel, is as far removed from the error of Antinomianism, "that banishes the preaching of the law from the Church," as from the spirit of Romish, Puritanic and Pietistic legalism. Whilst legalism darkens and corrupts the doctrine of justification by faith alone, Antinomianism exaggerates the antithesis between faith and works, so that the law loses its proper position in theology. The source of Antinomianism may be found in that form of Gnosticism which taught indifference in all those things belonging to the moral sphere of life and action. The Antinomianism of Johann Agricola which began as a reaction against Romish legalism and work-righteousness, soon degenerated into an utter indifference with respect to Christian life and conduct. But Luther completely refuted Agricola and taught the exercise of good works. He taught: "Man is inwardly, according to the Spirit, sufficiently justified by faith; it

remains only, in this respect, that this faith and sufficiency shall continually grow until his entrance upon a higher life. But he must yet tarry for a season in the life of the body, must rule his own body and associate with other men. This calls for the exercise of good works."

Not only did Luther teach the government or discipline of one's own body or of the flesh, but also those works which are useful to our neighbors. He taught that the Christian "has a pattern of this in Christ, his head, whom he should be like in disposition, and who, though He was full of divine majesty (*Form*), and had enough for Himself, and had no need of His life, works or sufferings to make Him good and secure for Him eternal happiness, yet emptied Himself of all this, did and suffered all manner of things, looking only to our highest advantage, and thus, although He was free, became a servant for our sakes." (Dr. Köstlin's Theology of Luther, Vol. I, pp. 415, 416.)

Luther also expressed himself with reference to the carnal abuse of evangelical liberty. "In the Latin edition" (of his treatise on Christian Liberty), "there is added for the benefit of those of whom such good things" (as the right understanding of Christian liberty), "cannot be said, and in order that they may not by their misunderstanding pervert the teaching, a declaration against *a carnal abuse of this doctrine of liberty.* He already anticipates such an abuse upon the part of a multitude of hearers: they (*quam plurimi*), when they hear of liberty, want to appear as free, and as Christians only in the despising of ceremonies, traditions and human laws, whereas the opposing party seeks to attain salvation only by the observance of these. He points, in illustration, to Rom. 14, 3. The liberty in question he declares to be not a freedom from works, but a freedom from opinions about works, i. e. from the opinion that we are justified by works." (Köstlin, Theol. of Luther, Vol. I, p. 418.)

Carlstadt, the radical and fanatical revolutionist and his deluded followers "utterly failed to grasp the central principle of saving truth and of real Christian liberty" and

eventually fell into unbridled license. Luther, however, always wisely took into consideration those "believers whose faith and apprehension of the truth are yet immature." There is nothing rash or violent in his utterances. "A broad line of distinction is drawn also between such matters," (religious forms and observances), "and things which, while not essentially evil, are yet such in so far as they are made a positive law and a snare for the conscience. It is the observance of these external things in which the believer, himself free, may out of love for others restrict himself." (Ibid. Vol. II, pp. 28, 29.)

EVANGELICAL LIBERTY VERSUS LEGALISM.

The whole theology of the Roman Catholic Church is strongly legalistic by reason of the fundamental error of the righteousness of the law being considered as a necessary condition on the part of man of his justification. This error is justly condemned in the 28th article of the Augsburg Confession, according to which the Romish bishops enacted or enforced laws "with a view to atone for sins and to merit grace by them; for if we presume to earn grace by such ordinances, it detracts from the merit and honor of Christ." Accordingly, "by this means the doctrine of faith and the righteousness of faith, were entirely suppressed—new holidays, new fasts were daily commanded, new ceremonies, and new honors to the saints were instituted, in order to merit grace and all blessings from God, by such works." The bishops ascribed sins to trivial things, such as the use of certain meats, the non-observance of certain holidays and the like, and thus brought about a servitude under their human traditions, laws, regulations and rules "as though there had to be among Christians, to merit the grace of God, such a divine service as the levitical, and as if He had commanded the Apostles and bishops to establish it, as some writers testify." By such human traditions sins were multiplied and consciences burdened.

Some of the Pietists in the Lutheran Church of Germany were legalistic. The pious and venerable Spener,

although the "father of Pietism," was conservative and surely not responsible for the extravagances of the later Pietists. He suffered more, as he himself said, from his inconsiderate friends than from his enemies. (E. J. W. in Luth. Cyclopedia.) The ultra-Pietists were a group of fanatical mystics and theosophists, who had departed from the ways of Spener and represented a movement in religion opposed to sound and conservative Lutheranism.

The Pietism of these ultraists degenerated into legalism. We read in the Luth. Cyclopedia by Jacobs and Haas, (Art. Adiaphoristic Controversies, II, p. 2), as follows. "The second adiaphoristic controversy was an outcome of the Calvinistic, legalistic view of Christian life that through Pietism had crept into the Lutheran Church. Whilst Luther, with a good conscience, enjoyed the natural gifts of God, and maintained that those who love God may, and even should, love His creatures also, though not beside or above Him, but under Him; and that God has created them for the very purpose that His children may enjoy them in moderation, thanking Him also for these gifts, Calvin, in accordance with his austere and severe nature and his legalistic view of Christianity, rather frowned upon such natural enjoyments. And just as Luther in this respect also was the model of the Church named after him, so the Reformed Churches and sects have, more or less, followed Calvin. Pietism, as such, in so far as it consists in laying a one-sided and exaggerated, and therefore anti-evangelical, stress on piety and sanctification over against justification and the liberty of a child of God, is not a Lutheran plant, but rather one sprung up on Calvinistic and Puritanic soil, and first imported into the Lutheran Church by Spener, who had become acquainted with it and favorably impressed by it during his stay at the city of Calvin, Geneva."

It is true that Spener did not go as far as many of his followers, "but he also maintained that whatever action does not *directly* serve the honor of God, our own or our neighbor's bodily or spiritual welfare, is sin, because at least a waste of time; and to rejoice in anything that is

not directly useful, but pleasant and amusing, is in conflict with Christian self-denial."

In Spener's opinion bowling and the use of tobacco could be permitted only when necessary to one's health. Many Pietists considered festive meals, taking a walk, laughing and all innocent amusements as sinful. In Francke's Orphans' Home the children were forbidden to play or engage in childish sports or games.

Many Pietists even went so far "as to deny explicitly the existence of adiaphora, that is, of things or actions whose moral character depends exclusively upon the circumstances under which they take place and the motives actuating those that engage in them. And, worst of all, abstinence from natural enjoyments and amusements was by many Pietists looked upon as *the* criterion of a true Christian — a very dangerous position, since it is not only sure to cause an uncharitable judgment of our fellow-men, but also may lead to grievous self-deception." (Ibid. p. 2.) It is true that the Orthodox of that day sometimes went to the other extreme in these matters, but it is certain that the moderate use of natural gifts and enjoyments is in itself not sinful. No *action* of ours is morally indifferent, but there are *conditions* in our natural lives that in themselves are indifferent, as they are neither commanded nor prohibited by Divine law or command. This liberty, however, must be limited by the consciousness of our own weakness, a proper regard for our fellow-men, so as to avoid giving offence, and the circumstances under which we may exercise or not exercise our personal Christian liberty. (Ibid. pp. 1-3.)

The Lutheran Church alone teaches and maintains the scriptural doctrine of evangelical liberty. The Church of Rome and the Reformed Churches and sects teach and maintain legalism. Rome binds the souls and consciences of men by laws, decrees, statutes, rules and ordinances devised by the Papacy. The Reformed Churches and sects following Calvin, are all, more or less, legalistic. The legalism of the ultra-Pietists was a foreign plant, taken

from the soil of Calvinism and transplanted into the Lutheran Church. Legalists of all kinds, Romanists, Calvinists, ultra-Pietists and Puritans have no conception of the glorious doctrine of the evangelical liberty of the Christians.

Puritan legalism is an offshoot of Calvinism. In it the believer is hedged in by numberless external and temporal rules and regulations based on human authority, proceeding from work-righteousness and seeking perfection in the rigid observance of externals in life and conduct. The Lutheran theologian, Dannhauer, rightly characterized the extreme pietistic views concerning *adiaphora,* as "silly and empty cavillings." The same may be said of the ridiculous views of many Puritanic sects of the day on things indifferent, concerning which there are endless trifling disputations engendering strife and contention.

Here we may mention the contentions concerning the Sabbath and Sunday. The Augsburg Confession (Art. 28), justly condemns the Romish hierarchy for "encumbering Christendom with the servitude of the law, as though there had to be among Christians, to merit the grace of God, such a divine service as the Levitical, and as if He had commanded the Apostles and bishops to establish it, as some writers testify." The same may be said of many sects of our day. Puritans generally consider the observance or keeping holy of the first day of the week "such a divine service as the Levitical," and look upon the observance of this day as if "He" (the Lord) "had commanded the Apostles and bishops" (or some other ecclesiastical human authority) "to establish it." The Seventh-day Baptists, the Seventh-day Adventists and other Sabbatarians have fallen into the same error as the Puritans, with the difference that the Sabbatarians, following the levitical, local and temporary regulations given only to the Israelites, teach the observance of the seventh day, as if Christ and the Apostles had commanded Christians to keep it. Both the Puritans and the Sabbatarians are legalists and teach contrary to God's Word (Matt. 12, 8; Gal. 4, 9-11; Col. 2, 16, 17.)

Both parties are "encumbering Christendom with the servitude of the law," when "neither the observance of the Sabbath, nor of any other day is indispensable."

Much is written and said to-day of the use of wine and other liquors. The evil of drunkenness are manifest to all. No man has written more vigorously against this monstrous evil than Martin Luther. But he never held the position that the proper use of anything created by the Creator of all things, whether meat or wine, was sinful. On the contrary: he held that the evil lies in the abuse of these things, either by excess ruining both soul and body or by giving offence to the weak (1 Cor. 8, 8-13; Rom. 14, 20-21). These are limitations of the use of these gifts of God, and these limitations cannot be fixed by general laws, but must be determined by the individual Christian conscience. "The greatest care must be taken not to declare that to be sin, which God has not forbidden, and that not to be sin which God has forbidden. Total abstinence has its justification, only in so far as it is a voluntary surrender by the Christian as a right which he acknowledges to belong to him, while it refrains from making its decisions of Christian expediency determining one's own conduct a standard to be enforced upon others." (Luth. Cyclopedia, Art. Temperance, by H. E. J., p. 507-508.)

The doctrine of the liberty of the Christian, according to which by virtue of his faith, he is "a free lord over all things and subject to no one," and yet at the same time "a ministering servant of all things, and subject to every one," is a glorious, comforting, heart-cheering doctrine. He is a king and priest unto God and "to these honors he comes only through faith." The liberty of the Christian is equally far removed from Antinomianism which despises and sets aside the Law and Legalism which confounds the Law and the Gospel, and would bring the believer under the servitude of ordinances.

Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty (2 Cor. 3, 17; James 2, 12).

SPIRITUAL GIFTS, TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT.

BY REV. R. E. GALLODAY, BALTIMORE, MD.

"Love never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

"And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

Corinth, with its wealth, its intellectualism, and its appalling wickedness, was a field which afforded full scope to the superlative missionary genius of St. Paul.

In his work, St. Paul, according to his own express declaration, could become all things to all men. To the Athenians he could quote the Greek classics. To the Roman officials he could quote the statutes of their legal code. But when he came to Corinth he resolved to lay aside every expedient. He could say, in after days, "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." And in the conflict which ensued, the cross, stern and forbidding in itself, an object of scorn, but consecrated by the blood of Jesus, and refulgent with the unspeakable love of God, won the day. By the simple preaching of the cross, with its story of love, and of blood, the ramparts of pride were battered down, prejudices were dissipated, stony hearts were melted, a congregation of God's people was gathered together. And this first Epistle to the Corinthians is a letter of reproof and advice, written by St. Paul, in later times, to these spiritual children which he had brought forth in the travail of his own soul.

This Epistle is one of the best pictures we have of an Apostolic church, with its hopes, its aspirations, its struggles, its imperfect conception of truth, its weaknesses, its failures. It sets before us the Spirit of God working, through the Gospel, with the imperfections of men, in the effort to recreate these men in the image of God.

NOTE. — A sermon preached at the Convention of the Joint Synod, Fremont, Ohio, August 28, 1904, and published by request.

This thirteenth chapter is the continuation, and the climax, of that division of the Epistle in which the Apostle treats specifically of spiritual gifts, embracing Christian life, and Christian service. For our further consideration, then, let us take as our subject:

SPIRITUAL GIFTS, TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT.

In other words, the gifts which are for time only, and those which become part of man's character, his life, and endure for eternity.

I. THE GIFTS WHICH ARE TRANSIENT.

There was a time when I dreamed of an Apostolic Church which was well-nigh spotless; which, as a Church, was in constant readiness for Elijah's chariot of fire. But fuller knowledge has dispelled this illusion, and with the passing of the illusion there have come clearer visions of the depths of human depravity, of the greatness of God's love, and of the power of divine grace.

The congregations in Rome, in Ephesus, in Corinth, were made up of men and women taken from the common humanity of which we are part. When they rose to higher things it was only because they were clinging to the hand of the one great helper of humanity — Jesus, the Savior of men. When they rose it was in spite of the clogs, inherent and adherent, which weigh down, so close to the earth, even the redeemed and justified children of God.

True, some of those people did enjoy privileges, and possess powers, not granted us. They had teachers directly inspired of God, and some of whom had seen the Lord Jesus. And some of those people were themselves endowed with powers of speech, of spiritual insight, of doing works, not vouchsafed to us. On the other hand, though we have not the teachers, we have the teachings, inspired of God. And if we do not have the special gifts some of those people possessed, because the need for them no longer exists, we

have our blessings which fully compensate us for their loss. The devout, intelligent student of the development of God's kingdom is privileged to behold Jesus of Nazareth walking the earth in statelier, more glorious form than was ever granted to those who saw Him in the flesh, with the eyes of flesh, save, perhaps, on the mounts of transfiguration and Olivet. He is to be seen thus in His Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

At any rate, there were sad derelictions in the Corinthian church. There were members who came to the Holy Supper in a state of intoxication. Others were inclined to put such a perverted interpretation on the law of liberty that thereby liberty was turned into license. And even among those endowed with those special gifts there was vanity, self-seeking, godless rivalries and bitter contention.

Those people had lost sight of the important truth that these gifts were not personal prizes for individual aggrandizement; but gifts to be used, as instruments, for the good of the common body — the Church.

To call these people to their senses, the Apostle reminds them of the pit from which they have been digged. He tells them the purpose for which these gifts have been given, and the spirit in which they are to be used. And as the final argument against this spirit of pride and self-glorification, engendered by the possession of those gifts, the Apostle tells them — they are but temporary, that, having accomplished their purpose, they will fail.

My children! the Apostle would say, why do you forget your holy calling? Why this godless pride, coming from the possession of God-given gifts? "What hast thou that thou ddst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?" Why this bitterness of spirit where loving service should prevail? Do you not know that you are all members of one body? and that each member best serves itself by serving well the body? Do you not know that each member is a partaker of the honor bestowed on the common body? and that, conversely, the whole body participates in the praise which the

individual member receives? Why have you set your hearts on the mere instruments of service, which, however useful, are to perish when the purpose of their bestowal has been accomplished?

"Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail." The prophet stands as the mouthpiece of God. Whether he bring revelations of truth hitherto unknown, or whether he expound truths already known in a general or superficial manner, thus bringing out deeper truths and applying them to the needs of men, his office is an important one. Through it the believer is built up. Through it the unbeliever is to be won. The office of the prophet is to bring the mind and heart of man into closer touch with the mind and heart of God. But important as has been this office, important as it is yet to be, in unfolding the kingdom of God on earth, it shall have an end. Indeed, in one signification, that of revealing truth, it has come to an end. And in the signification of the teaching office it shall end also when the present dispensation shall come to an end, the Church Militant become the Church Triumphant, and all be taught of God.

"Whether there be tongues, they shall cease." There is room for questioning whether the gift of tongues in this place means the ability to speak languages not learned by the ordinary method of acquisition, as was evidently the case on the day of Pentecost, and as many expositors, especially in former days, believed was the meaning in this instance, or whether it means an ecstatic expression, in deep, mystic language, of spiritual emotions, of prayers and praises But these doubts need not greatly exercise us. The point is that it was one of the charismata of the Spirit, and one especially coveted by the Corinthian brethren, because it was, in a measure, a spectacular gift. But however useful it may have been, it was of man's self a thing apart, a temporary gift, which, when it had accomplished the object of is bestowal, was to cease. When we get to heaven the confusion resultant from the pride and folly of Babel shall be done away. There we shall understand and speak only the language of heaven, of God, of love.

"Whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." Knowledge is an excellent thing. Its price is above rubies. It cannot be valued with pure gold. Our pastors and people ought sedulously to cultivate it. Knowledge is power. It serves important ends. It is a source of great pleasure. And yet, it shall vanish away. Not in the sense that there shall be no more knowledge, but in this sense that the knowledge we are capable of acquiring in this present state of being shall fade into nothingness by the side of the knowledge which shall break in on our perfected minds once we have passed beyond the confines and limitations of this present life. Our present knowledge shall vanish as the light of the star vanishes with the advent of the sun.

Here those who have laboriously gathered the largest stores of information are like children who have gathered little hanfulls of pebbles on the seashore; beyond them stretches the limitless ocean of unexplored truth. How often we are forced to say, even of the things with which we come in contact every day — I do not know. In our own chosen field of theology how little we really know. There are, and we thank God that there are, grand, triumphant certainties in the spiritual world, which stand out like polar stars to guide us through the maze in which we live. But these truths are known more by spiritual intuition than by an action of the mind. As to knowing these things by the processes of mind, we behold them much as we do the nebulous haze of the milky way — through a glass darkly.

We have an illustration of this vanishing state of human knowledge constantly before us. In nearly all branches of human learning the text-books of a score years ago, in great part, have been relegated to the lumber-rooms of antiquated things. Much of that which bears the dignified title of science must be rewritten every decade. And men change their philosophical systems much as they do their manners and their dress. Why, oh why, should the spirit of mortal be proud?

Thank God, the time is coming when all this knowing, which stands on the dim borderland of knowledge, shall

vanish away. And God's people shall come into their long lost heritage; see with unclouded vision, and know as they are known.

If St. Paul was constrained to write thus to the Corinthians with respect to the gifts of prophecy, of tongues, of knowledge, and the like, because they desired these things as an end in themselves, instead of desiring them as a means to an end, what would he say, what does the Master say, of the things which absorb so nearly all the interest and activity of so many professing Christians of to-day? Pride swells in many bosoms; but pride of what? Of gifts of the Spirit? No! It would be bad enough if this were so. But instead of this it is pride of dollars and of cents, of houses and merchandise. Men still desire the gift of second-sight, not often to divine the mind of the Spirit; rather that they may forecast the state of the market, the rise and fall of commodities. Men are emulous of the gifts of speech, but very seldom that they may excel in prayer and praise. Is it not that they may shine with their own light, and be able to turn the voice of speech into the metallic clang of silver and gold? There are rivalries in our midst, but mostly along what lines? Character, the things of the soul, which shall endure when the monuments of marble and brass have been wasted away by the trying hand of time, and the world itself have passed away into the nothingness from which it came? Are they not, in large part, for things either as gross as the earth we tread, or as ephemeral as the shadows which fall athwart our path? There are contentions among us, plenty of them. But for what are we contending? For the things which shall become an inalienable heritage? The things for which Christ contended? and Paul? and Luther? Are our contentions not far too frequently mere factional fights, the result of pride, and petty jealousy?

Why will we not learn, learn betimes, that the things which flit across our pathway of life like shadows; the things which serve a purpose, and perish with the using, are not worthy the absorbing, distracting, exhausting attention of those who are heirs of immortality? Do not misunderstand

me. There is no one who is less inclined to preach a doctrine of indifference to the present order of things. It is, in a measure, through the material and temporal that we are to work our way up to the things which are spiritual and eternal. That which the Apostle urges is that we learn the true valuation of things. As creatures with the breath of immortality in us, we are to appreciate the things which are temporal only in so far as they can be used in attaining the eternal good, the kingdom of God. The things which are material are to be prized only in so far as they can be made to minister to the spiritual. And as an aid in keeping ourselves from becoming absorbed in, and distracted by, the perishing things of this life, the Apostle would have us label them all, writing on the first — it shall fail; on the second — it shall cease; on the third — it shall vanish away.

But, my brethren, when we have thus labeled these, and all kindred things, we have not labeled everything of this life. There are gifts which are transient, but there are also

GIFTS WHICH ARE PERMANENT.

"Covet earnestly the best gifts. * * * But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. * * * I show you a more excellent way. * * * Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

What new views we have of every thing when we are living in the steady, enlightened consciousness that we are walking the path which leads to the throne of God; that we are living in a world where, in spite of sin and its disastrous consequences, all things are working, however mysteriously, to aid us, God's children, in our homeward, our heavenward, journey. Under such conditions life assumes a new dignity. The things of earth shrink and fade into their proper proportions as subordinate agencies in the accomplishment of the one grand design for which God has placed us in this world. But in passing from the scenes of earth to the glories of heaven there are things we shall carry

with us; qualities, virtues, gifts of God, which shall have become part of the tissue of our being. Among these the most prominent will be the three theological virtues — faith, hope, and love.

These three gifts are so closely related, so intimately interwoven, they work so harmoniously hand in hand, that it is often hard to distinguish them. But there are marks by which they may be profitably differentiated. Faith is the source of hope and love. Faith is that which clings to the declared promises of God. Hope is that which looks forward to, and, in a measure, anticipates, and by anticipation now enjoys, the good things of God yet to come. Love is that which goes out to God Himself, the giver of every good and perfect gift. Faith receives. Hope waits. Love gives. Faith battles; hope fortifies; love ministers. Faith overcomes the world. Hope is willing to renounce the world. Love helps to save the world.

"Now abideth faith." To speak adequately of faith one should have the tongue of St. Paul, of Augustine, or of Luther.

What is faith? We define it primarily, as an explicit knowledge of God; especially of Jesus Christ, the God-man, with all that He has done for us, and all the blessings He bestows on us, for our salvation. To the knowledge of these truths, revealed to us by God, in the Scriptures, we add assent, approval, another act of the intellect. And to these two, the knowledge which God has given, and the assent for which this truth has prepared the way, we add confidence — the Spirit-wrought surrender of the will, of self, into God's hands. This is faith, a God-given gift, a faculty of the soul, which brings us back into touch with God; which prepares us to receive, and becomes the vehicle by which we receive, God's gifts — forgiveness, sonship, heirship, new life, new powers. Faith is the underlying principle of man's life in God. It is the electric wire which connects us with the fount of Godhead, and along which

Would you ask what, in addition, this faith is capable of appropriating.

Would you ask what, in addition, this fait his capable of doing for a man? Read the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. Read the life of St. Paul, who, by faith, could rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, even while prison walls shut out the light, and chains clanked on his limbs. Read the lives of the countless martyrs, the lives of the missionaries; look at the tens of thousands of humble lives which have been purified, enriched, ennobled, lifted above the pettiness and sordidness of this present life, and all by the power of a simple faith in the Son of God.

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.

"And whosoever is born of God overcometh the world.

"And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

And this faith shall endure as long as God and man endure. Death cannot destroy it. The perfect life, and the glories of heaven, will not make it superfluous. The faith of the present will doubtless change as to some of its aspects, and some of its objects; but in so far as faith is the acknowledgment of dependence, in so far as it is the medium by which we humbly receive the gifts of God's love, by which through eternity we shall live, faith can never be extinguished without the death of the soul. Confidence, the child-like repose of the creature in the creator, which is the very quintessence of faith, must be as endless as the life of God's redeemed and glorified children. Faith abides.

"And now abideth hope." — Our religion is a religion of hope. The Bible is a book of hope, the Word of a God of hope. Way back near the dawn of creation, when man stood mourning a lost Eden, the everlasting Father drew near, and whispered in the ears of His erring children: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. This was the birthday of hope for a lost world.

Hope, the expectation of future good, is the sustaining power of the children of disappointment, of suffering and death. But the natural man's hope is only too often a fitful

will-o'-the-wisp,— a mirage, leading into bogs and quagmires, and never fully satisfying.

It is the Christian's lively hope, the hope of an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven, which becomes the true anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast. It is hope, the Christian's hope, born of faith, and rooted in the promise, which sustains our flagging energies when we are weary and worn with life's battles. It is hope, the vision of the perfect men and women we are to be, which inspires us in our endeavor to attain the things which are true, and pure, and lovely, and of good report; for "Every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as He (our Savior) is pure." It is hope which gives steadfastness to our purpose. It is hope which brings a measure of peace and joy into life, even in the midst of defects and sufferings. Hope is the pilgrim's vision from the delectable mountain.

And, like faith, hope is transmuted into life. In a measure, the hope of the present will be changed into fruition. But hope itself, that emotion compounded of desire and ever renewed expectation of future good, will be as deathless as the deathless soul. Hope is a permanent gift.

"And now abideth love." — As we proceed difficulties increase. Artist, poet, orator have all vainly tried to do justice to this subject. No wonder they failed. The substance of Deity is expressed in this one little word — "God is love."

Part of the difficulty lies with the misconceptions and perversions of men. Love with many is but a blind passion, often base, at best only an unreasoning instinct. And with the noblest of men there is in the conception of love too much which is narow, srelfish, exclusive, and individualistic. The love which St. Paul lauds is not of this kind; nor yet is it mystical, or sentimental, much less hysterical. The love of St. Paul and St. John is wrapped up in, and pervades, the whole system of theology, both on its Godward, and its manward sides. It runs back into the revelation of the divine nature. On man's side it has its origin in his

faith in Jesus, and His redemptive work. It mounts up to heaven and worships at God's throne. It runs out in the daily life of God's child, and governs all his actions. This love is the realization, in man, of the angels' song: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men."

Love is the greatest of God's gifts to men. "Now abideth faith, hope, love,— but the greatest of these is love." Love is greatest, not because it will endure longest. There is no particular excellence in mere duration. The common flint may endure as long as the purest diamond. Love is greatest because it is most Godlike. Faith and hope appropriate for self, love serves; and service is the Biblical ideal of greatness. "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Brethren, how about this gift? Is it receiving the attention among us that its importance deserves? Is there not often cause for us to tremble when we consider the Biblical doctrine of love? Let there be no alarm. Not one scintilla of the doctrine of faith do we yield. We hold fast, with good old Lutheran grasp, to the grand, Biblical, comforting doctrine of justification by faith alone. We claim no justifying merit for the warmest, most active, love. And yet there is merit in love. There is this merit in it that God wants us to have it, is pleased when we do have it, is grieved when we lack it.

According to our own Confessions love, the reflection of the love wherewith Christ loved us, is a necessary, an inevitable result of that faith which justifies. And where the result is lacking there is room for questioning whether the cause is working. Let us not forget that there is a faith, so-called, which has ever been the fruitful parent of indifferentism, secularism, and the whole brood of isms, the end of which is the death of the soul. We dare not forget that he who hates his brother, who delights in strife, however much he may talk about faith, has no spiritual life in him.

It is God who says: "Every one that loveth is born of God." And the negative proposition may be maintained with equal positiveness. He that loveth not is not born of God. He that loveth not cannot know God. He may know something about theological propositions; but, important as this is, it is altogether a different thing from knowing God Himself. St. Paul knew theology, and was a past-master in the art of stating theological propositions with point and power; but he says: "I know *whom* I have believed, and am persuaded that *He* is able to keep that which I have committed unto *Him* against that day."

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing. Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth."

Brethren, we need more of this greatest of Christian graces. We need more of it in our pulpits, more of it in our pews, more of it in our business, more of it everywhere. And there is only one place where it can be gotten, in the Word, and in the Sacraments of the God of love. There is only one place where we can get this love, at the foot of the cross. There, as we behold the incarnation of love suspended between heaven and earth, His body pierced by the ruthless iron, His lifeblood trickling away, and all that we poor, vile, death-deserving sinners might live, there, there only, is love born in the soul.

And, now, what is the conclusion of this whole matter? In few words, simply this: here we have set before

us two kinds of gifts. The one class represents the very best of earth; but still labeled — transient, failing, ceasing, vanishing away. The other class sets before us the gifts which go to make up life, to form character, to produce Godliness; they are the things which do most toward making earth a paradise, and become our adornment for eternity. Which shall we choose? Which shall we cultivate? Amen.

NOTES.

By PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D.

ITALIAN PROTESTANTS.

During the past year a Consiglio Evangelico d'Italia was organized by the representatives of the different branches of Protestantism of Italy, for the purpose of systematically unifying the mission work in that country. The commission is not yet fully organized for work, and for the present the different Protestant missions are still controlled by the different churches. The Waldensians held their annual synodical convention in their ecclesiastical center, Torre Pellice, in the historic valley. The whole convention was practically devoted to the revision of the constitution, which has now been finally adopted, with its 198 paragraphs. The *Italian Evangelica,* the chief organ of the Waldensians, reports that the leading additions to the rules of the Church are these: 1. That no congregation can have more than *one* regular pastor, and when the need of the church calls for more work than the pastor can do, the congregation is to supply helpers from within their organization, to be called *ausilore,* or helpers: 2. Every congregation has the right to permit its women to vote, on exactly the same conditions that prevail in the case of men; 3. After a pastor has served a congregation continuously for seven years, he has a right to ask to be transferred to another charge. After a service of fourteen years this transfer must be made. In case, however, an indepen-

dent congregation desires to retain its pastor, then they re-elect him, with a four-fifth's majority vote; 4. No member of the "Table," or General Executive Commission of the church, can remain in office longer than seven years. The Waldenses are called upon to deal with a unique problem, in the shape of a noteworthy increase in the emigrations from the valleys, so that, numerically, the congregations are decreasing. The present Moderator of the "Table" is G. P. Pons, while Walter Prochet is President of the Evangelization Committee. The theological school at Florence is manned by three teachers, Professors Comba, Bosio and Luzzi. The Evangelization Committee urged that the church schools of the Waldensians be kept up wherever they can compete with the state schools, but where this cannot be done that they be discontinued. The same committee warned against the hasty erection of churches and chapels at places where congregations are not yet firmly established. The proposed union with the *Evangelica Italiana* has not yet been consummated.

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME XXIV.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.
1904.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

NUMBER 1.

PAGE

Introductory. By the Editor..... 1
Religious Tolerance. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D.,..... 9
The Division of the Decalogue. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 22
The Question of Higher Education in our Synod. By Prof. Carl Ackerman 27
The Believer's Final Acquittal. By Rev. J. Sheatsley..... 38
Notes and News. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 53

NUMBER 2.

The Analogy of Faith. By Rev. C. C. Hein..... 65
Philosophic Thought in its Bearing on Theology. A Lecture by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 84
Some early Lutheran Hymn Books. By E. E. Daume..... 99
The Overtures from the Lima Lutheran Educational Association to the Joint Synod. By Prof. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D..... 113
Notes and Items. By Prof G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 119

NUMBER 3.

The Predestination Controversy. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 129
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D..... 150
Theology and the Scriptures. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 158
Our Practical Attitude towards other Lutheran Bodies. By Rev. A. O. Swinehart..... 166
Sermon. By Rev. S. Schillinger, A. M..... 176
Notes and News. By Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 187

NUMBER 4.

Baccalaureate Sermon. By Professor Edward Pfeiffer..... 193
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D..... 204
The Thorough Preparation for the Catechetical Class. By Rev. F. W. Abicht 212
Does the Spirit of Missions Exist in Our Synod in its True Character? By Rev. Joseph Beck, A. M..... 220

PAGE
Development in Theology. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D.. 229
The Peace of the Church under Constantine. By Rev. J. C. Schacht 238
Christian or Evangelical Liberty. By Rev. P. A. Peter..... 243
Notes and News. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 253

NUMBER 5.

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. By Rev. C. B. Gohdes, A. M. 257
The Apologetical Character of the New Testament. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 269
Suggestions for the Improvement of Sunday Schools. By Prof. Theo. Mees, Ph. D..... 277
The Thorough Preparation for the Catechetical Class. By Rev. F. W. Abicht, A. B..... 285
Christian or Evangelical Liberty. By Rev. P. A. Peter..... 297
Spiritual Gifts, Transient and Permanent. By Rev. R. E. Golladay 307

NUMBER 6.

The Precious Old Truths of the Reformation. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D..... 322
The Unity of the Scriptures. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 351
The Practical Treatment of Secretists in Church and Mission Work. By Rev. J. M. Senter..... 359
New Testament Apocryphal Books. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D. 369
Synodical Sermon. By Rev. O. S. Oglesby, A. M..... 379
Notes. By Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D..... 382

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XXIV. DECEMBER, 1904. No. 6.

THE PRECIOUS OLD TRUTHS OF THE REFORMATION.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Our churches have again been celebrating the anniversary of the great Reformation which occurs on October 31. It was on that date in the year 1517, that Luther nailed up his 95 theses in Wittenberg against the traffic in indulgences, by which an emissary from Rome was gathering money for the papal purse and deluding souls to their destruction. It was a mild and modest beginning of world-wide import, though Luther, the poor monk of Wittenberg, had no thought of the great commotion which would ensue and the great result which would be the outcome. The modest man was the instrument in the hands of God to do a great work, and the Reformation of the Church ensued. That was a work so stupendous that its success becomes comprehensible only when it is recognized to be God's work. As such our churches commemorate it, not to glorify Luther, but to glorify God, who through him has done great things for us.

It would not be right if our congregations neglected this festival. They must not forget what God has done for them. The Lutheran Church commemorates the great facts in the history of our Lord, and stirs up its pure mind to remembrance whenever the date of this occurrence suggests them anew. Advent, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Pentecost are great days to us, because they commemorate great things done for us. The Reformation festival stands in a somewhat different order of divine blessings upon the hu-

man race, but it was a blessing of God unto all people still, and those who are partakers of this blessing would be unthankful if they did not recognize it and give God the glory for it. Why should we not give glory to God in the highest for raising up Martin Luther to preach anew the everlasting gospel, which the Church had ignored or forgotten?

Nor is there less reason in our day than there was in days gone by to recall the great truths upon which the Reformation rests. Indeed there is a special reason why just at the present these truths should be brought anew to the consciousness of our people. The Church is forgetting many things that should be kept in constant remembrance. The foe of our salvation is making his attacks upon our citidels just as he did in the days of Luther, and does this just as assiduously now as he did then. It looks as if he did it more insiduously now, but he always adapts himself to the conditions whilst he remains the bitter enemy of souls and of Christ who came to save these souls from the damnation that sin has brought upon them. We have no danger of life and limb to insure now, as it was in the days of the Reformation, for the power of Rome is broken now, and we are free to confess the gospel of our salvation through the free grace of God in Christ without let or hindrance. The pope has no longer the power to condemn us to the rack or to the stake. But in the joy of our liberty we are but too prone to forget that this liberty is a result of the Lutheran Reformation. The conditions are different now, since the power of the pope is broken; but the devil is still at work, and the pope has not been converted to the truth in Jesus. The work of the Reformation is still going on and encounters the same hostility that it did in Luther's day, though circumstances and conditions are changed. The war is still going on and will go on until the end of time.

The Reformation and its glorious events lie so far in the past that our busy age is prone to forget its great achievements. It has largely shaped the progress of the world for nearly four hundred years, and we are reaping its benefits even while we fail to recognize their source.

Its principles are eternal, and any disparagement of them in the interest of science, physical or mental, social or political, is only the result of the human weakness which always attaches to our reason as well as to our work, and inalienably subordinates the higher to the lower, rendering man penny wise and pound foolish. The principles of the Reformation are recognized in the courts of heaven and even if man in these days should be too much occupied with material and temporal interests to give them due consideration and appreciate them at their true eternal value, they shall stand forever, and if thinking men and earnest souls are diverted by transient matters from their truth, which is perpetual and unchanging, so much the worse for them. Matters of first importance should have first attention. To us this is beyond controversy, that if ye seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness you will not assign to the principles of the Reformation a back seat in the court of intelligence and conscience.

We Lutherans are thankful that God has in His mercy preserved a Church that holds firmly to these principles still, though the opposition has never ceased since the work began. We are thankful to God for this because by the revelation which God has given for our guidance we know that the devil and the world and the flesh is against us. And we have abundantly experienced this. Rome has power still, and unfortunately not a few who call themselves Protestants are deceived by its sophistries and led to cry for only works of charity — as if there could be any charity that controverts and counteracts the will of our loving Lord. The truth has made us free; let us stand fast in that liberty by steadfast adherance to the truth.

This truth is attacked now not only by the Romanists, who have decided to adhere to the pope rather than to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church, but by so-called science and criticism that is in league with popery, often without knowing it, in its contention for the supremacy of human reason and the ability of human wisdom to work out man's destiny. Nothing is more needful in our day,

as against all godless rationalism and reliance on human ability than the simple principles of the Reformation, that God alone is Ruler of the universe and that His Word alone is authoritative in the Church which He has established, and that only faith in Christ, who is the Redeemer of the world, can save the soul from death. It is worth our while to give renewed attention to these great principles of the Reformation.

I. The first of these is that the Bible, in which is written by inspiration of God the will of the Maker and Ruler of all things, is the Christian's only rule of faith and life. God is sovereign Lord of all, and Christians are people who by grace are brought to recognize that sovereignty, and to find the revelation of it in all its mercy as well as righteousness in the Holy Scriptures. Not all men recognize this. Sin has entered into the world, and death by sin. There is a human life which is not Christian, although it is still human. This the Reformation had to encounter. The Roman Church had set up for itself, independently of the Lord of all, though claiming authority as His institution and thus overriding the Scriptures. Man was created as an intelligent creature with free choice, and forgetting that sin has deprived him of his original liberty, he still asserted it, and seemed right in asserting it. Man may eat and drink, and do all to the glory of God; he may eat and drink and have no thought but that of gratifying an appetite which is natural and which presses for gratification. Man may speak and act in the name of the Lord Jesus and give glory to God and the Father by Him, or he may use words and perform deeds with no other design but that of giving vent to the inclination which is in him. This eating and drinking ought to be to the glory of God, these words and deeds ought to be in the name of the Lord Jesus. That Christianity requires. But it does not annihilate humanity so far as this fails to meet the requirement. There is human thought and action that is not Christian, and its reality is not denied because it is not Christian. It is human, notwithstanding the sin which corrupts humanity.

Now there is much that is human that the gospel sanctifies without changing it in any otherwise than in this respect of elevating the motive and rendering it holy. The holy heart performs holy acts, the unholy heart performs unholy acts. In this respect the motive decides whether the act is Christian or not Christian. Art and science may be Christian or it may be otherwise. But Christianity is a positive revelation and a positive power which never can be otherwise. There are things which a Christian or a heathen, as far as the substance is concerned may do alike. To build a house or lay out a park, to construct a science on the basis of the facts perceived or carve out a statue according to our ideal in the imagination, may be Christian or it may be not. Hence the scriptures give no law in regard to such matters further than that all works, whether of this or any other kind, shall be done in the name of the Lord and for the glory of God. The reason is that these are not matters of salvation. The blundering scientist and the bungling artist may be saved notwithstanding their blundering and bungling, because salvation does not depend on the accuracy of science or the beauty of art. The Bible reveals a plan of salvation of which art and science know nothing, but which it is needful for us to know in order to escape the wrath to come. Of this revelation we speak, and because it is all that we know of the way of salvation we insist that it is the only rule of faith and life.

1. God alone rules over the consciences of men. That is what the operation of conscience in the human soul means. That is what nature, so far as it instructs us at all on this high subject, and what the Bible, which instructs us fully on matters too high for nature, teaches and impresses. God made us, and He made us for the accomplishment of His will. We are right when we recognize the supremacy of His will; we are wrong when we set our own will against the will of our Maker and Lord. And this is not a matter of indifference. He holds us strictly to account for our conduct. His wrath is revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who seek to dethrone the Creator

and enthrone themselves. Both in matters of life and in matters of faith He alone is Lord.

Only what He commands is law that can bind us. Man has no authority. Two facts, which we recognize, seem to militate against this broad statement:

One is that in the family and in the larger family which we call the State, the power of government is exerted and obedience is enforced. This is conceded to be right. Children must obey their parents, and citizens must be subject to the powers that be. But the inference is wrong that hence there must be some authority of men over men, which contravenes the claim that such authority belongs only to God. For the government of the family and of the State is a divine institution. The powers that be are of God, and that is the ground of their authority. What right has the father to rule over the son other than that God has commanded the children to honor their father and mother? And what right has the ruler of a state to demand the obedience of its citizens? There is no right but that which God gives in the command to be subject to these powers. The authority is alone in God, and men exercise it only in His name and are obeyed, so far as conscience has anything to do with such obedience, only because it is exercised in His name. The powers that be are of God, and on that account alone are men bound to obey these powers.

The other fact that seems to conflict with the truth that God alone rules in the universe and that man has no authority over his fellow man is the obvious power which is exerted by individual men over other men, and the influence of majorities on the rest of the community. It is certainly true that the action of many a man is controlled by the will of another. But how is such control exercised? Never in such wise that one man is recognized to be more than another man. They are all simply men, and they are not recognized as more than men, and therefore as having a higher power and authority than themselves. The way of exercising power is therefore either by supplying good reasons which will bring others into agreement with our-

selves and thus result in volitions harmonious with our own, or by deceiving them as to the authority of that which we will, representing it as the voice of a power to which they and we are equally subject. When an arrogant hierachy succeeds by the high claims which it puts forth to impress on men the belief that it acts in the name of God and that resistance would be fighting against God, the conscience may be bound in virtue of the usurpation, but the proof is not furnished that the soul intelligently submits to human authority. God alone rules, and man is not subject to his fellow creature, but only to the Master and Ruler of all. What He requires is obligatory on us, what He does not command cannot bind us. All law has its foundation in God. Him only shalt thou serve.

If this is plain in regard to law, it is doubly so in regard to the gospel, or the truth which is set before us as the object of our faith. Only God can know what are His thoughts and His purposes in regard to our fallen race, and only He can make known to men what He has done and is doing and purposes to do for our deliverance from sin and death. When men tell us that this dogma or that, this declaration or that is necessary as an article of our faith, what else could sober-minded Christians do than ask where has God so written? Palpably it is superstition to accept in confidence whatever men may seek to impose on our credulity, and humbly to bear the impositions as necessary parts of the Christian faith. Such proceeding not only brings Christianity into disrepute among thinking men and ultimately among unthinking men also, but its effect, if possible, is worse than that; for it leads poor souls to destruction by inducing them to put their trust in human figments that have no power to save. For there is not the least divine warrant for the belief, which is itself one of the human products that disregard divine right and authority, that sincerity will save, though it makes no account of the only Savior and the only way of salvation through faith in His name. The Lord God, against whom our race has sinned, has prepared a way for our rescue from the death and damnation which are the

sinner's due. He so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. This He has made known to us, and has given us instruction in regard to its import and purposes, that we might not err in the way of salvation. The gospel sets forth the whole plan with clearness: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Rom. 1, 16, 17. This is the glorious truth unto salvation that souls by the power of the Holy Ghost are to believe. If they believe what the Lord has not declared and has not promised, they have leaned on a broken reed. How would they find help anywhere but in the name of the Lord! "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man." Ps. 118, 8. Least of all is it good to put confidence in man when the eternal interests of the soul are at stake. Man cannot save us; man cannot know how God has purposed to save us, except so far as God has revealed His purpose and His way. How utterly therefore against all reason and against all right must be the procedure of those who maintain that men may dictate to their fellow men what they must believe to be saved, seeing that there is no possibility of their knowing what is the mind of God, except so far as He has revealed it to all men, and of course there can be no authority to declare what they do not know and to impose as articles of faith what has no divine warrant. The Lord alone can declare the truth which all men are to embrace in faith.

2. And this Lord has spoken. He has not left it to us to discover or devise His commands and promises. He could not do that without making us divine and giving His glory to His creatures. Man is indeed endowed with high powers of intellect, and may derive some knowledge of God from the contemplation of nature around him and within him. As everything is organized for righteousness he is capable, in the light of conscience, of distinguishing

right and wrong and of making just laws. But even in this doctrine he may err, and the laws which he makes could not commend themselves to his fellow men as divine and carry with them obligatory authority for his conscience. And in the domain of faith the assumption of such authority is absurd; because what is assumed is impossible. Neither nature around us or within us makes any communications concerning that "mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints." Col. 1, 26. For that mystery is the eternal purpose of God to save the lost through faith in His own dear Son, who came into the world to offer His life as a ransom for sinners. In pursuance of His counsel of grace He could not leave this unrevealed, because that would render it ineffectual. Man would never have known the good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people if God had not spoken. In that case we would have nothing but human devices, which have no power to save, as the religions of heathen men save nobody. But God has spoken. He gave us commands and promises. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1, 17. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." Heb. 1, 1-2. We accordingly have a "thus saith the Lord" to enlighten us and guide us, and have no need to subject ourselves to any human yoke, which could only, because it is human and so without divine authority, be a yoke of bondage. It is slavery to put our consciences under the arrogance of men in matters of law, and it is slavery intensified to criminality when we subject these consciences to the arrogance of men in matters of gospel. Men cannot save us, why then give heed to their proud pretensions? God can save us, why then not hear His voice, who alone is Lord, and be free from the tyranny of men? Their word cannot help us; God's Word can: hear that! To that Word we appeal, as a "sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye

take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place." 2 Pet. 1, 19.

3. But Moses and the prophets, our Lord and His apostles lived many centuries ago; how shall we assuredly know what they spoke as the Word of the Lord? This suggestion of reason has given rise to doubts, and to expedients that favor the arrogance and the absurdity of man making laws for the government of their fellow-men's consciences and making devices for the salvation of their souls. There is no fault in the divine provision for making known the will of the Lord in regard to faith and life. The difficulty has its rise only in human sin and the usurpation of divine authority which results from the dominion of sin. What Moses and the prophets spake, what our Lord and His apostles taught is on record, and the law and the testimony are clear and sure. But there are those who, for a reason, bring confusion into the subject by claiming the incompleteness of the record and the need of tradition to complement its contents. It seems reasonable that the memory of much that was thus divinely spoken should be preserved by men who heard it or were told of it, and that the commands and promises which were thus preserved should be recognized as divine and therefore authoritative. Should not what holy men spoke of old in the name of the Lord of all be just as binding on the conscience when it is not put officially on record as when it is written in the inspired Book? Does not its divine authority depend on its divine origin rather than on its divine perpetuation by a special medium of communication? It is not to be denied that the thoughts thus suggested seem reasonable, and unquestionably they have exercised their influence on men who meant well. But they were used by men who meant ill, and who desired in that way to make an opening for the introduction of commands and promises that are not divine and on the semblance of reasonableness they met with success. When the Bible refused to help these people they appealed to tradition, which was alleged to contain much of the divine Word spoken that is not embodied in the divine Word

written. Rome was able in this way to maintain many a false doctrine, and to support many a tyrannical command. In the great struggle of the Reformation leading Romanists admitted that so far as the Scriptures were concerned Luther and the Lutherans had unquestionably the better of the argument, but alleged that they still could uphold their cause by an appeal to the fathers. No doubt many in their ignorance supposed this to be a decisive argument, because to their minds, antiquity was equivalent to divinity. But even those who had risen above such absurdities were not above assuming that the fathers were conservators of the ancient traditions, and that what they taught was a faithful presentation of what Christ and the apostles taught, though the teaching was not authoritatively preserved in writing.

Luther and his coadjutors were not men to be deluded by such superficialities and sophistries. They appealed to the Bible. Their argument was that it is written; their reply to usurpations was, Where is it written? Were they not right? Was not their action in strict accord with the mind of God when they cried: "To the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8, 20.

The same Lord who in mercy made known to us His gracious plan of salvation, that we might believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved, in pursuance of the same mercy made provision that the truth unto salvation should be written for our learning. This too commends itself to human reason, if it is at all willing to subject itself to the light which is given us beyond the natural. For it is not rationally to be expected that men would preserve in any degree of purity that which does not correspond to their habits of thought and feeling and life. The sin that is in man would solve the communications which they received. There is no security against this contaminating influence but that of making a pure record of that which was taught by our Lord, and by prophets and apostles in the name of the Lord. Hence God in His wisdom and

mercy gave us the Bible. That is a record of what was spoken in the Lord's name and at the Lord's command. What is there written is authoritative; what is there written is all that our God in His infinite wisdom and love thought it needful to communicate for our salvation. It is sufficient, because the all-wise God held it to be sufficient. It is all true, because the all-wise God ordered this to be communicated to His creatures for their salvation; it is all necessary, because His love ordered it to be written for our learning; and it is sufficient, because the all-wise and loving Lord commanded that just this should be revealed and transmitted to all generations in all time for their salvation.

So the Scriptures themselves teach. They claim that what they contain is the declaration of the divine will given by inspiration, and therefore in His mind necessary and sufficient to execute the purpose of His wisdom and love. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16-17. The truth unto salvation is not only mercifully revealed that we might know it and have the benefit of it, but it is also written by divine inspiration that we might be sure of possessing the revelations. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15, 4. In our longing for assurance in regard to the momentous matter of our salvation we are not referred to tradition, which may or may not correctly report the declarations of inspired men, but to the law and the testimony as this is authoritatively recorded by men whom the Holy Ghost inspired for the work, and whose writings are therefore in contents and form, the very Word and the very words of God. Hence St. Paul says to Timothy: "Continuest thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee

wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ jesus." 2 Tim. 3, 14-15. The things which we must learn and continue in, are those which the Spirit of God teaches in Holy Scripture. These make us wise unto salvation; these give the man of God perfect enlightenment and furnish him thoroughly unto all good works. Hence our Lord commands us to search the Scriptures, because their testimony is unimpeachable. Those things that are written in Holy Scripture for our learning are the things which the Lord who inspired them would have us know and believe and do for the salvation of our souls and for the glory of His name. If anything else had been necessary, that too would in the infinite wisdom and mercy of God have been spread upon the inspired record. Therefore nothing that God did not deem requisite "that the man of God may be perfect," can be accepted by the man of God as requisite. What God regards unnecessary, that His children too regard unnecessary, and they are not willing to let it be laid as a yoke of bondage upon their necks. Traditions may go for what they are worth, but their worth must be determined by the Scriptures. These are the Word of God; only these are the authoritative Word of God. The will of the Lord of all alone must rule, and that will is made known to us infallibly in the Bible alone.

4. Hence Luther and those who stood with him always made their appeals to the inspired word as the revelation of the divine will, and were undaunted when powers that seemed mighty menaced them. What would the pope and the emperor, with all the power which they unquestionably possessed, do against the almighty Maker of heaven and earth? In the estimation of the flesh and the world they could do much. They had all the physical forces of the earth, so far as these were known as part of man's dominion, under their control. What would a poor monk do against such powers? He could do nothing, and he did not pretend that he could do anything. The sincerity of his soul and the earnestness of his desire to secure its salvation from the death that was biting it, forbade any thought of pitting

his strength against the world and the flesh and the devil. Apparently the very recognition of impotency which the grace of God works, makes against the believer and the Church which is the congregation of believers. It is not so. It is impossible that it should be so. For how could man ever come to a recognition of his impotency if he did not come also, by the grace of God, to a knowledge of the potency of the Lord and of the Gospel which is His power unto salvation to all them that believe? No one has ever understood Luther, no one ever will understand him, who thinks only of the human factors that may enter into the problems which the Reformation presented. Very likely your reason and mine would, so far as the question of human wisdom and expediency is concerned, have concluded it best to inquire first whether the pope would approve the course pursued and protect his loyal subjects in prosecuting it. He did not pursue such a policy. He had no policy. He had the Word of God, and by the grace of Him who gave him the light of the Gospel he had the determination to maintain it. He believed, and therefore he spoke. Luther's conduct sometimes seemed the extreme of fool-hardiness, and sometimes appeared the acme of insolence. They were simply the confiding conduct of the child that unquestioningly does its father's bidding, and the humble words of the child that declares, My father said so. Only it was our Father that is in heaven to whom he rendered obedience and to whose bidding he appealed, and to that Father's voice as it was on record in the inspired Scriptures. He was the servant of God, and he had no prudential thought as to how his action in word and work according to the Word which His Master had spoken would eventuate. He did not even care, and therefore felt quite easy when all the world was in commotion. What the Lord commanded and what the Lord promised, would He not stand good for that? And if He commands me to do a thing and tells me to proclaim a thing will not He see to it that all will result in good? It was faith in the written Word of God that made Luther the great hero that he was, and it was

faith in that Word which achieved the great victory of the Reformation. The Lord is God, and those who stand on the Lord's side can bid defiance to all His foes. "The Word of God they shall let stand, and not a thank have for it." To this principle that the Word of God is authoritative, and it alone, the the Lutheran Church still adheres.

It will therefore be easily understood why Luther and the Lutherans would not be restrained or intimidated by appeals to traditions, or to the decision of councils, or to the declarations of popes. They were always ready with the question, What does the Bible teach, when the decision of disputed questions was sought from other sources. Perhaps some of the fathers did teach otherwise than the Bible teaches; what of that? Perhaps some councils did teach otherwise than the Bible teaches; what of that? Perhaps the popes did sometimes teach otherwise than the Bible teaches; what of that? That was not a matter of fundamental concern to Luther and his co-laborers. Indeed, that was to them rather a matter of indifference. In their childlike sincerity and straightforwardness they even admitted such facts as were alleged against them with any show of proof. They admitted that some of the fathers taught what could not be substantiated by Scripture; they admitted that councils had sometimes erred and decreed what God, according to the Scriptures, had not decreed; they admitted that popes had sometimes gone wrong, and that many a papal decision contravenes the Word of the Lord. Did such an admission at all embarrass them in their contention that God alone rules, and that His decisions are given in the Scriptures? Not at all. It only led them to insist more strenuously on the Bible as the only divine authority, and to reject everything that had no Bible warrant or authority.

II. But the Church of the Reformation stood all the more earnestly on this principle of the exclusive authority of the Bible, because this is not only a matter of right, but of eternal salvation. Hence we would not do justice to the subject before us if we did not point to another great principle of the Reformation, namely, that salvation is

through Jesus only by faith in His name. Usually this is called justification by faith and is often designated as the material principle of the Reformation. Obviously this embraces two great truths, both of which are vital for the salvation of man and for the proper eppreciation of Luther's calling and work, and of the great Lutheran struggle of the sixteenth century as well as of the constitution of the Lutheran Church ever since those eventful times; to-wit, that Jesus Christ alone is Saviour, and secondly that faith alone can apprehend this Saviour and secure the righteousness which avails before God. Let us devote a little space to the consideration of each of these propositions.

1. There is no Saviour from sin and the death which it entails but Christ. He is the Redeemer, He alone is the Redeemer. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4, 12. In the whole work of the reformation this was a fundamental question. Not that the Roman Church had directly denied the apostolic creed which had prevailed in all christendom and prevails in all christendoom still. We desire truth, and would make no unjust charges and unfair imputations. It is rather a joy to us that Christ is honored in some degree in all the churches, and this remains a joy and a hope to us even when we find it impossible to fellowship some of these churches. That matter of degree is the trouble. The Lutheran Church is often decried as exclusive. We acknowledge the impeachment, though it is by no means always a soft impeachment. We have often found it hard. It is sometimes very unkind and very uncharitable though it pretends to be made in the interest of charity. But the truth remains that Luther's insistence on the salvation in Christ was just as exclusive as his insistence on the authority of the Bible. His motto was not only the Bible and the Savior, but the Bible and the Saviour *only*. That was an exclusiveness which was plain and palpable, and which is plain and palpable now; and as it was offensive then, we fear it is just as offensive now. And for that the Lutheran Church stands, whether

ye will hear or forbear. Luther insisted that there is no other Saviour than Christ, not only that He saves, but that nobody else and nothing else can save.

God elected Him to be the Saviour of sinful man, who could not save himself. What man could not do, God in His mercy did for him. If there had been any other way by which the deliverance of man from the death into which he had plunged himself could be effected, the great sacrifice on the cross would not have been made. How could God deliver His own dear Son to an ignominious death at the hands of His creatures, if the purpose of infinite love for our lost race could have been otherwise attained or attained without such a stupendous cost? Christ alone could save and therefore God in His infinite love "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all." Rom. 8, 32.

He alone could save. The situation was such that the deliverance of man by man's power was entirely out of the question. As a moral nature endowed with will and consequently responsible he had made his choice, and it was against righteousness. Let us as reasonable creatures think reasonably. How could the soul that decided against God and righteousness, and thus turned wholly away from God, find a way of deliverance in its unrighteousness from its unrighteousness? Even to an infidel, if he once comes to a recognition of the facts in the case, the thought must be preposterous. Only God could help the creature that had turned away from God. According to all human thinking this thought too would be preposterous, that God would intercede for His foolish creature who had decided against His sovereignty. But when man reckons only with human factors he is always astray. The world was ruined and helpless, but God did not abandon it. He could yet save His sinning creatures and He spared not His own Son to accomplish this salvation. He resolved to do for man what man had failed to do for himself, and to suffer for man what his failure made imperative as a condition of

blessedness. To this end it was necessary that He should become man, in order that He might do what man could not do, and yet as man make it available for man. "When the fulness of time was come God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4, 4. 5. The Son of God became incarnate for our salvation. The Word that was God and by whom all things were made, became flesh and dwelt among us, that He might rescue us from the consequences of human folly and human sins. There was no other help, because God chose this as our only hope. Christ is the Redeemer; there is no other. If Luther and the men who were his colaborers insisted that there is no other help and no othr hope for lost man but that which God had provided in His only Son, to whom therefore all the glory and all the honor must belong, were they not right in their contention that He is the only way of salvation? The incarnate Son of God is alone the Saviour of the world, and the glory of this salvation cannot be divided between Him and the creature whom He has purchased with a price. Only those who, in pursuance of the wrong that was done in the fall of man, can see no object in maintaining the glory of God, will censure Luther or fail to appreciate his work in this regard. God alone can save, and He saves by the mission of His Son to take man's place by becoming man Himself. "Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh." 1 Tim. 3, 16. And this mystery, with all its glorious impact, the reformers were right in upholding at every hazard, because this was the great revelation of God for the comfort of man.

The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, to the end that He might fulfill all righteousness in our stead, doing all that was required of us and suffering all that was laid upon us for our failure to fulfill those requirements. Christ, as God-Man, was not only constituted in His wonderful person to be our Redeemer, but in pursuance of the great mystery of the incarnation He accom-

plished His mission and effected our redemption. As our substitute He left nothing incomplete or imperfect. What divine righteousness demanded of man, the man Christ Jesus rendered for His brethren of the human race. There was nothing left for us to do to render ourselves acceptable to God. Even now, we fear, such a statement may sound strangely to some ears, and that not only to Romanist, but also to Protestant ears. It will not seem a wonder therefore that Luther had a heavy task to perform in his maintenance of the Saviour's glory against the pretended merit of human works. All that God requires of us was done by our blessed Lord. He alone could do it, and He did it in fact. There was nothing left undone. He fulfilled all righteousness. Therefore there was nothing left for man to do in order to render himself acceptable to God. Any claim that this or that or the other work is necessary yet to satisfy the divine righteousness can only detract from the honor and glory of the dear Saviour who fulfilled all righteousness in our stead, that we might be accepted in the Beloved. And so the matters stands in regard to what is called the passive obedience of Christ. The law that required holiness demanded the punishment of sin, which is unholiness. How could it be otherwise than that divine righteousness would maintain itself against all opposition. If the intelligent creature would obey the holy will of God it would be well with him; for he would thus accomplish the purpose for which he was created and in the fulfilment of his mission be happy. If in the exercise of his power of choice he would set his own wisdom against that of his Maker and decide against that Maker's holy will and wise plan, how in his utter failure could he be otherwise than miserable! It is alleged indeed that the Creator's pity might be expected to save the foolish creature from ruin. All that could be done in this regard was actually done by the mission of the only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. But the demands of righteousness could not be abandoned or abated. If men obey, well; if not, that righteousness will resist the op-

position to the death of the opponent. The holiness of God is His attribute of self-preservation. Man in his sin would destroy God if he could; God in His holiness does not mean to be destroyed. He will not yield; He cannot yield, because He is the Holy One; if the foe will not yield, he must inevitably be crushed, because God is master, not man. As surely as God is God it can not be otherwise than that sin will be punished. The wages of sin is death; the soul that sinneth, it shall die. So death came upon all men, because all had sinned. And this death the Son of God came into the world to endure. He was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification. Did He fully pay the penalty of our offences, as He perfectly fulfilled all righteousness for us, or did He leave some things for us to do that satisfaction might be rendered to the righteous demands of God? Must penances be inflicted and purgatorial fires be endured before God's wrath against sin is appeased, or did Christ pay the whole penalty of our transgression? Is He truly and really and fully the Sáviour of our souls, or is He this only in part, leaving us to groan under the burden of the other part, and in our helplessness to fall into despair? Luther had learned the truth of Holy Scripture, and to him it was therefore an easy matter to decide such questions; and he had found peace in the perfect righteousness of a perfect Savior, and therefore experienced no hesitancy in maintaining His honor and His glory against all the folly that was put forth by men who knew little of the misery of sin and death and therefore knew little or nothing of the glory of the Redeemer and the peace of God which results from justification by faith in the great Redeemer, who accomplished all that was necessary for man's salvation. He maintained that Christ is our Savior, as the Holy Scriptures made certain. He insisted that nothing which man could do could complement the Saviour's work or render that more effectual for men's salvation. What our Lord did and what our Lord suffered was the fulfilment of the law for us. That is everlasting truth. Only to Him belongs the glory. Any claim

of honor and glory in this respect must be rejected. No one has fulfilled all righteousness but the Son of God. He has done all and suffered all that the law requires. Therefore His is all the glory and any claim of man to have rendered satisfaction by deed or suffering must be disallowed not only because it is a claim that is false, but because it is a claim that dishonors the Saviour, who has done and suffered for us all that divine righteousness requires. Jesus alone is Saviour, and the men of the Reformation would rather die than give His glory to another, because they knew too well what misery that means.

This divine plan of salvation through the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world is preached by inspiration of the Holy Ghost throughout the world. The Scriptures know of no other way to be saved. The prophets and apostles preached this way, and this way they set forth, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost in the written Word which we call the Holy Scriptures.

These Scriptures declare the law of God. They show us what the righteousness of God demanded of His creature that was endowed with intelligence and will. They show us further what the consequences must be, if this creature failed to comply with such demands. Therefore "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3, 20. The creature failed to fulfill his mission, and the condemnation of the law was upon him. The study of the law therefore results in the consciousness of sin that is the only possible result of a study that is not pursued in self-delusion, but that aims at truth. The law requires righteousness, and we are unrighteous; it demands holiness, and we are unholy. We do not conform to the law, and it therefore condemns us. We see this, and therefore "by the law is the knowledge of sin." That is the only result possible when there is any honest and sincere comparison of our life and conduct with the law. What then shall we do? We are condemned and whither shall the condemned soul flee for refuge from the terrible curse that God has laid upon sin?

The same Scriptures that contain a revelation of the law of God contain also a revelation of God's will to save our lost race. This revelation is the gospel of the grace of God in Christ. It tells us of the perfect obedience of our Saviour in our stead. It shows us how all righteousness was fulfilled in His life of holiness, and how God was willing in mercy to impute this righteousness to us, because in His counsels this was the purpose of the mission of His own dear Son. It shows us how the penalty of all our sin, in suffering even unto death, yea, the ignominious death of the cross, was endured on our behalf, that by His stripes we might be healed. The reality was revealed to us. There was no salvation for man by his own efforts, but in the merciful counsel of God there was salvation still. Of course it was not by man's effort. That way was seen to be futile and hopeless. But when all man's wisdom failed and all man's power was impotent, God interfered for man's salvation. We could not help ourselves, but that did not show that God could not help us. He could help and He did help by sending His own dear Son in the likeness of human flesh into the world. This is what the gospel proclaims. These are the good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people. The gospel is the proclamation of pardon for the sake of the salvation rendered by our Saviour.

How then could Luther and the Lutherans otherwise than declare against all human notions and contrivances that set the wisdom of man against the wisdom of God and led men to put their trust in man rather than in God? The controversy turned not only on the infallibile authority of the Scriptures, but equally upo the saving contents of which they certify us and alone can certify us. They testify of Christ as the only Saviour. The human inventions by which He is displaced dishonor Him and deprive us of peace and ultimately of salvation. They cannot supply His place and accomplish the saving purpose for which He came into the world. Indulgences, merits of saints, satisfactions, purgatorial fires, meritorious works — what

do they all mean but that the grace of God and the merit of Christ do not suffice to deliver our souls from the death to which sin has doomed us? It was needful for the glory of the Redeemer and for the salvation of the redeemed that the principle of salvation by grace alone and by Christ alone should be maintained at any cost; not only that the mercy of God and the merit of Christ are necessary for our rescue from the eternal doom of sin, but that these alone effect the rescue, so that the praise is not divided between the Saviour and the sinner, but the glory be given to God alone. And it is needful that this great principle of the Reformation be earnestly contended for still. It has lost none of its importance now. "For Thine, O God, is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever."

2. But there is another element requisite to set out this principle in its completeness. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotton Son, that whosoecer believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Justification is by faith alone. Some explanation of this may be necessary, but it will be a comparatively easy work if the foundation be kept in mind that Christ alone is Saviour to the exclusion of all human merit.

Justification by faith means justification by the grace of God alone, through the merits of Christ alone, appropriated by faith alone. It does not mean that there is some other merit for our salvation besides that which the incarnate Son of God acquired by His perfect obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, or that there is any other power than that of the grace of God by which the sinful soul can be brought to lay hold of the Saviour's merit, which can alone avail for our salvation. There is no power that saves but that of divine grace, and there is no merit that avails for our salvation but that of the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. But there is no product of grace in the souls of men that could appropriate the salvation secured alone by our Saviour save the faith which the Holy Spirit produces through the Gospel. It means that the satisfaction rendered by our blessed Lord

for us to the demands which righteousness makes on us is perfect; that He did all that the law requires of us, and suffered all that it imposes for our failure to fulfill its requirements; and that now, when the Holy Spirit makes announcement of the precious truth of our redemption, we have only to accept it as a precious fact and enjoy all its benefits and blessings. Justification by faith means appropriating the truth in Jesus unto our salvation, the contents of which truth is that God in His infinite mercy gave His own dear Son into death for our sakes, and that His merit secured by fulfilling all righteousness in our stead is accepted by faith, so that God sets down the Savior's righteousness to our account. When the sinner, by the power of God's grace, submits to God's wise and merciful way of rescuing us from death by the death of His Son in our stead, believing the gracious tidings of such salvation as set forth in the Gospel and by the presence of grace exerted in that Gospel, he is declared just for Christ's sake; that is, he who has no righteousness of his own has by faith the righteousness of Christ, which is perfect and which avails for all men, imputed to him. That is justification by faith, the imputation in the court of heaven to the righteousness of the Saviour to the believing sinner, who has and claims no righteousness of his own.

But why should this be by faith? To Christian hearts the answer should be sufficient, that God has thus ordered it. His plan is that he that believeth shall be saved. The fact would be plain, whether we understood the reason of it or not, and Christian hearts would accept it on the divine testimony as a fact most precious, whether they could explain or could not explain why in the counsels of God it was ordered thus. But we have not been left wholly in the dark as to the reasons why, in the divine plan, such an important place was assigned to faith. There is no way else known to us by which divine truth could become effectual in human hearts. It is, therefore, not because faith is a virtue that merits salvation, but because it is the means by which this salvation that Christ alone merits, and that is

offered by grace alone, can alone be appropriated by the sinner. As an act or a state of man, by which the demands of divine righteousness, as these are set forth in the law, are supposed or expected to be fulfilled, it is just as important as any other human work or achievement. "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified," says St. Paul, Rom. 3, 20. Whether these deeds be mere acts of external conformity to the divine rule, or whether they be sincere and honest efforts to be holy because God is holy, the case remains in this respect the same. No human performances, external or internal, sincere or insincere, can fulfill the requirements of divine righteousness. If there were any lingering doubt in the minds of any who reverence the Scriptures, they must be banished by the reason which the apostle gives for declaring that no flesh shall be justified by the deeds of the law. In the place just quoted, he continues, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Not an imaginary holiness is to be the reuslt of our sincere study of the law, but a consciousness of our sin as a terrible reality. The fulfilment of all righteousness has been accomplished, but not by us. The accomplishment avails for us, but not through our wisdom or effort. Christ, in infinite mercy and by an unspeakable sacrifice, has done it all. The merit is His and the glory is His. This is declared to us in the Gospel. As a free gift the righteousness required for us by the Saviour is offered to us. His part of the great sacrifice for sin, and the great mercy offering pardon to sinners for the sake of that great sacrifice, are real and true, whether men will hear or forbear. And now when the blessed proclamation is made to man in his misery, what shall he do? Shall he set it aside as an idle dream or a delusive fable, either in whole or in part, and declare that he needs no Savior, at least in no such sense, that this Savior alone delivers from damnation, and that he is quite competent to work out his own righteousness and pay his own debts, without the humiliating admission that he is spiritually insolvent and that morally he is hopelessly bankrupt? Or shall his yearning for deliverance from the body

of this death and fleeing for refuge to the hope set before him in Christ as his only help, accept the pardon and the peace which the Gospel graciously offers? If he renounces the grace of God, which bringeth salvation in Christ, he is lost; if by this power of grace which the Gospel brings he believes, he is saved. He is saved by faith, because believing is the only conceivable way in which the truth unto salvation can effectually be introduced into the human heart and bring it into fellowship with the blessed Saviour, who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification. Not because faith is itself a meritorious work that fulfills the righteousness of the law, nor because it is a power in the soul that brings forth good works, but simply because it accepts the truth of the Gospel and lets the saving grace of God have its saving way, is salvation by faith and by faith alone. It merits nothing, it appropriates the all-sufficient merit of Christ.

Many still ask why there should be so much insistance on justification by faith alone. Why could not Luther and the Lutheran Church make some compromises in view of the great opposition in the Church of the time, compared with which they were but a little flock? And why may not now, when the Romanists continue their controversy and so many Protestants virtually join them in their contention, something be yielded to the clamor for works as well as faith in the order of salvation? Do we not admit that faith itself is a work of grace that exists only in the hearts upon which the Holy Spirit has begun His regenerating and sanctifying work? Is it not conceded that faith is a spring of all Christian virtue, and that when once this is wrought we are created in Christ Jesus unto all good works? Are not Lutherans as well as other Christians ready to grant that faith without works is dead, and that the true faith is always that which works by love? We concede it all; yea more, we emphasize it all and insist upon it all. But we concede nothing against the proposition that justification is by faith alone. We concede nothing, because the Bible concedes nothing. With the Holy Spirit, who has given

us light and life, "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3, 28. To those who will not accept the Bible, we have no apologies to make. If you will not believe this truth of God, you see to that; the truth remains, for all that, just as men continue to have a soul, though some materialists have declared their inability to find it with all their arts of dissection. But to those who agonize for deliverance from the sin and damnation that is denounced against sin we have a reason to offer. It is exactly the same reason why we must insist that Christ alone is the Savior. Justification is possible if our dear Lord really fulfilled all righteousness for us; if He had not done this, but had left a part, though it were but a small part, to us, to that extent we would be in doubt and distress, and could not have peace in believing and rest for our souls. He fulfilled all righeousness. That is the divine assurance, and that is so far assuring and comforting that we are to believe, and thus to have peace. But now comes the other question, Does all that avail for us, when we believe, or are certain requirements to be fulfilled before the redemption in Christ Jesus can, in the design of God, be at all available? You see that this opens again the whole question whether Christ fulfilled all righteousness; whether He fulfilled all righteousness for all men, or whether He left some things for man to accomplish as a factor in his salvation, or excluded some men from the operation of His gracious purposes. If Christ died for all men, that through faith in His name all men might be saved; if His active and passive obedience was a perfect fulfillment of all righteousness, so that the righeousness declared by the Gospel for our faith is perfect; and if faith according to the divine plan is to embrace this perfect righteousness, secured for all men, what more then could be necessary for the sinful soul's justification? Why disturb the peace of souls that labor and are heavey laden by additional requirements which the Bible does not require and the souls cannot render, and if rendered at all could only do so by detracting from the honor and glory of the Saviour, who alone can save? The

Reformation apprehended the counsels of God, as the Lutheran Church does still, and insisted that salvation, being by the merits of Christ alone, could not be otherwise than by faith alone, which relies on these merits.

Hence, it was that the Evangelical Christians, led by Luther, renounced and, in the name of Jesus, protested against all creature merit and work-righteousness, and therefore denounced all papal usurpation of power to prescribe meritorious works and lay these on the consciences of Christian people. The poor people! Nothing more powerfully and penetratingly shows the ravages of sin on the earth than the use that is made of the ignorance of men, even within the sphere in which they might assert themselves, if they would only use the power that sin has left them. In every domain of life there are always demagogues who utilize their superiority of intelligence, often very small indeed and generally very shallow at best, to compass their own ends without regard to any man's happiness but their own. The papal court had an existence — the slang of our time would say that it had a "soft snap" — which it could not yield without a sacrifice that to the parties concerned meant a sacrifice of everything that was worth living for. These leaders of Romanism, even if some of them secretly and even sighingly admitted that Luther was entirely and unquestionably right, though the great majority still resented and resisted all his imputations, resorted to every expedient to render their position and their contentions plausible in the eyes of the public. They hesitated not to circulate the most infamous slanders about the poor, modest monk, who was called to lead the army of unbelievers, in their desperate endeavor to invalidate the testimony of the Bible, by discrediting the humble monk who quoted it and insisted on its divine authority.

Even today these reports are circulated anew by a Jesuit author, whose influence is great because he has the reputation of being an honest man, but who is only an honest Jesuit, whose accepted principle of probabilism, which Pascal in his "Provincial Letters" made so ridiculous, but which

still survives in the moral theology of Romanism to this day. Even if Luther had been a bad man, the testimony of the Lord is sure. But the people are easily confused, and Romanism did its utmost to maintain itself and to this end to render the Gospel powerless among the people. Is it any wonder then that Luther was dirven to see, what he from his training was loth and therefore slow to see, that the pope, exercising his enormous power to thwart the purposes of God and prevent the oppressed people from fleeing for refuge to the hope set before them in Christ, was the great hindrance in the way of truth and righteousness, and therefore the very Antichrist. And he was not the man to be silent when he saw it. Neither the devil nor the pope could terrify his soul; that was stayed on God, who is mightier as well as more merciful than all the foes of the truth in Jesus.. It might seem a mere theological refinement to some men of his day, as it unquestionably seems so to some professing Christians of our time, to insist without wavering that salvation is by faith alone, without the deeds of the law; but to Luther it was a question of life and death, because it was a question about the only name through which we can be saved. If salvation is by the perfect obedience of our Saviour, announced by the Gospel and received by faith, then all is joy and peace in a perfect Saviour's merits, which avail in time and in eternity; if it is by our own inperfect obedience, whether in whole or in part, then there is no rest for the soul and all is darkness and doubt about its final salvation.

And so the Evangelical Lutheran Church stands to-day, and means to stand until her Lord shall come again, notwithstanding the railing accusations brought against her of exclusiveness and uncharitableness and all illiberality. The head and front of her offending is only this, that she insists on salvation through Jesus only, and therefore through faith only, as the means of appropriating the righteousness which is in Jesus only. The Reformation has brought to light the great principle that justification is by faith alone. Rome has never accepted it. She still maintains the merit of

saints and the efficacy of good works and the necessity of ecclesiastical obedience, to the great dishonor of Christ, who alone is our Saviour, and will not under any circumstances give His glory to another. And, alas! many who are called Protestants, and even some who claim to be Lutherans, secretly or openly yield to their cry and lay stress upon good works as the essence of Christianity.

The Lord shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. When He comes, shall He find faith on the earth? Perhaps in no period of the world's history have the attacks of the enemy of our salvation been more fierce and more insidious than now. The stronghold of Christianity, in its reliance upon the infallible truth of the Bible and the great salvation through the redemptive work of the Word made flesh, is now assaulted with a boldness that in other days was hardly possible. The foe has grown bolder in proportion as concessions have been made to his pretended science and historical investigations and better understanding of the records by higher critical methods. The result of this science and criticism usually is reasonable, in the sense that the Wod of God is subjected to the reason of man. Thus the Bible is made of no effect and justification by faith is declared unreasonable. Romanism triumphs with its glorification of man and human achievement, and evolutionary speculation and higher criticism supports its Pelagian claims by removing all divine authority of the Bible and leaving the field to the pope, since poor humanity, in its feeling of dependency, in spite of all its blustering about independence, yields to some authority, though it be nothing higher than a fetish or a spook.

Let us hope that the celebration of the Festival of the Reformation has aroused some minds to a better appreciation of the interests at stake, between the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the anti-Christian institution of Rome, and that devout reflection on these interests will, by the grace of God, strengthen many hearts to resist unflinchingly all encroachments upon the absolute authority of the Bible as God's Word and upon salvation by faith in the Redeemer

of the world as man's only hope of salvation from sin and death.

THE UNITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

The leading problems in modern theological discussions are all of a fundamental character. It is a singular phenomenon, and as deplorable as it is singular, that the essential truths of Evangelical Christianity are now again in the forefront of debate. Not the accidentals and incidentals, but the cardinal teachings of the Scriptures, the *articuli stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,* constitute the debatable ground between the schools and tendencies of theology. The Reformation taught that there were two cardinal principles, a formal and a material, with which Evangelical theology and the Christian Church must stand and fall; and yet these two principles, the absolute authority of the Scriptures in all matters of faith and life, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone, are undermined, not by the historic antagonists of gospel truth, the Roman Catholic Church, but in the name of "scientific" research by Protestant theologians themselves. Especially is it the authority of the Scriptures as the final court of appeal that is denied and various substitutes are resorted to, such as "Christian Consciousness," and "the Historic Christ," to furnish theology with some foundation upon which it can stand, since the "juridic" authority of the Word, i. e., the "Thus saith the Lord" is no longer accepted by those who call themselves "advanced" or "modern" scholars. The difference between the old and the new theologies is fundamental. There is practically no common ground between them, and accordingly no possibility of a compromise or harmony. An impassible gulf is fixed between them. At heart they are antagonistic and mutually exclusive. Only one and not both, can be true.

One of the doctrines on which they differ essentially is that of the Unity of the Scriptures. Do the Scriptures teach one and the same system of truths or not? To this old

theology answers Yes, and modern theology answers No. The former has for centuries maintained that the different books that compose the Old and the New Testament, although extending in their composition over a period of more than fifteen hundred years, written in different languages, by dozens of different authors, and consisting of different kinds of writings, history, poetry, prophecy, gospels, epistles, etc., yet all though in different ways and manners, contain one body of truth, one set of principles, one kind of teachings; and they do this because the writers all were inspired by the one Holy Spirit, who guided them into all truth and whose purpose it was in all these writings to unfold the one plan of God for the salvation of lost mankind. Over against this we are now told, that the different books of the Bible contain only the religious feelings, convictions and teachings of the individual writers, and that these represent different types, trends and tendencies, without any necessary inner connection or harmony, and often in outspoken antagonism to each other. Peter's theology is not the same as Paul's theology or John's theology, and it is declared out of the question to harmonize the teachings of Romans on justification with those of James. In the Old Testament it is claimed that at the oldest period in Israel's history Jehovah was merely a local and national God, not superior in character or power to the gods of the neighboring nations; and that only later an ethical character was ascribed to Him and the claim put forth that He was the only true God. Ideas like these in thousands of variegated forms and shapes are put forth, all for the one purpose of showing that the Scriptures are merely the record of the growth of religious views in Israel and the early Church ,in which growth only to a limited degree an inner harmony or unity can be recognized, and which accordingly abounds in contradictions and antagonistic teachings.

The genesis of this view of the Scriptures is to be attributed to the general spirit of modern theology. His-

torical development is the controlling thought not only in theological but in all scientific research of the times. The factors and agencies that have made things what they now are in fact are to be traced in their workings and activity, and this purpose is applied both to the physical as also to the mental and the spiritual world. Development is the witchword of modern science in all of its ramifications and departments, and in most cases this means a natural development. The spell of Darwinistic thought has also been cast upon the Scriptures and the study of theology. The danger in this whole matter is found in the exaggeration of a truth that it emphasizes. The demand for an historical study of the Scripture is certainly justifiable, as the Scriptures are not only a revelation but also the history of a revelation. Biblical theology has its place by the side of Dogmatics, and it certainly was a weakness of the older theologians that the Biblical as an historical branch that depicted the different stages and steps of the unfolding of revelation, not only in the Old and the New Testament as such, but also in the individual groups of books, in the individual books and writers, as these differences actually exist, was not developed by the side of dogmatic theology which expresses the unity of the Scriptural teachings as compared with the legitimate diversity as brought out by Biblical theology. Even the older theology recognized the fact that Paul was the apostle of Faith, John the apostle of Love, and Peter the apostle of Hope, and thus in principle accepted the underlying idea of Biblical theology as an historical discipline. Withou in the least encroaching upon the unity of the Scriptures, it is perfectly correct to speak of a Joannine, a Pauline, a Petrine type of theology in the New Testament, as it is to speak of a Mosaic and a prophetic theology in the Old. Just as three preachers all proclaiming the truth and only the truth, will preach differently on the same text, one dogmatically, a second exegetically and a third practically, in accordance with their individualities and the requirements of their congregations; thus too the sacred writers, especially in the

New Testament, taught the one inspired truth they all proclaimed in accordance with their own individualities and the character of their congregations and audiences; and this feature, which also makes most of the New Testament writings "Gelegenheitsschriften," constitutes the chief mark of what is legitimately called the "human factor" in the Scriptures.

It is the abuse of these facts that has led to the denial of the unity of the Scriptures. Under ordinary circumstances a difference in authors, in the character of the books, in language, and especially of such a period of time as elapsed between the first books of the Old Testament and the last of the New preclude the possibility of an absolute agreement in thought and facts. Even in the case of single authors, such as Goethe and Shakespeare, it is impossible to harmonize their thoughts at different times and in different writings. And it must be frankly acknowledged that without the idea and fact of inspiration the unity of the Scriptures would be more than improbable. Modern theology, proceeding from its more or less naturalistic standpoint, cannot otherwise than see in the books of the Bible a literature not unlike that of other peoples and hence subject to the same weaknesses and infirmities of error and mistake and contradictions. The abuse and not the use of the historical principle and its distortion into a naturalistic factor to the exclusion of a special guidance of the Spirit in the contents and composition of the Scriptures is chiefly or solely responsible for the refusal to accept the unity and complete oneness of the contents of the Scriptures. This refusal does not stand out alone as an individual fact in modern theology, but is only one way in which its general character and kind finds its expression. It is a part and portion of this theology as such.

And yet the unity of the Scriptures is a doctrine of paramount importance that cannot and dare not be sacrificed by Evangelical theology. For with it stands and falls the inspiration of the Word. If the various books of the Scriptures contain only the different religious experiences,

feelings and convictions of their human authors, and even if these are, from a religious point of view, the most gifted and brilliant that the world ever produced, it yet remains a fact that these experiences, feelings and convictions may be and in all probability are contradictory. They cannot come from one and the same source and cannot constitute one and only one system of truth. If inspiration means anything it certainly means that the writers of all the books of the Old and the New Testament wrote *one* truth, however differently they may have conceived and reproduced this one truth. If this *one* truth is not found in the Scriptures, but only a collection of more or less contradictory views, then inspiration is not a mark or characteristic of the Scriptures at all. The unity and the inspiration of the Scriptures are mutually supplementary and complementary; the one cannot exist without the other and the one is demanded by the other. To deny the unity accordingly is the same as to deny the inspiration of these writings.

And still worse, the denial of the unity is to deny that the Scriptures really are the truth. How can they be the truth when they do not teach one doctrine and inculcate one set of principles? If Peter and Paul and John do not teach the same theologies throughout, then the questions of Pilate can be repeated: What is truth? Who is then to decide what parts and portions of the Scriptures, which of the Biblical books and which of the teachings of these books are true and which are false? It is one of the provoking features of modern theology that it will not credit the Scriptures with as great a degree of inner harmony as men generally give to the average secular writings. It seems to take particular delight in emphasizing what it considers contradictions and the like in the Scriptures, and the application of the same methods to the writings of a Homer or other old authors would make sad havoc of the best specimens of literature. If the Scriptures really do not contain more inner harmony and unity than modern criticism attributes to them, they deserve no confidence and reliance and have no right to claim to be the source of our religious guidance.

It is one of the mysterious things in modern theology that men will utterly deny the oneness of Scriptural teachings, will accept contradictions literally by the hundreds between the covers of the Bible and yet soberly claim that the Bible is the great religious book of the world. If an historian like Herodotus or Thucydides were accused of having so completely overturned the actual course of historical development as this is maintained of the Pentateuch and such books as Chronicles, which are openly charged with being nothing but "pious frauds," then these Greek historians would simply be cast aside and no hypocritical claim would be made that they are still to be regarded as the highest sources for historical research. In short, with the rejection of the unity of the Scriptures, there goes hand in hand also, the rejection of the *truth* of the Scriptures. Even if the truth should be hidden somewhere in this mixed and mongrel conglomerate of religious views, who is able to discover this truth or to determine according to what principles this truth is to be measured or gained? The whole matter becomes a subjective affair and in the end there will be not an objective guage or measure of truth, but only a subjective choice or selection that may be as incorrect and as unreliable as all subjective matters are. With the loss of the unity of Scriptures we lose also the objective basis of our faith and hope. Revelation is gone, inspiration is gone, the foundation of our doctrine, dogma and creed is gone. The Scriptures become only "sacred books of the East," like the Vedas of the Indians or the Avesta of the Persians, but with no more reliable teachings than these latter contain.

And what all this means from a practical point of view and for practical Christianity is evident at a glance. From the practical side the loss is even greater than from the theoretical; because a number of persons affected is greater and because a theoretical blunder is not infrequently rectified practically, especially in religious matters, where a man's faith is often much better than his creed. But to sacrifice the unity of the Scriptures virtually means that no answer can be given to the old yet ever new question: What

must I do to be saved? If the answer to this question is not given in a uniform way in the Scriptures; if the law has one answer to give and the prophets another; if the "Original Christianity of Christ" gave a substantially Jewish answer; and if Paul so modified the original preaching of Christ that he developed a new theory of atonement, and if the apostles themselves do not perfectly agree on such fundamentals as the Person and the Work of Christ, and especially on justification, what is the soul that inquires for the way to salvation to do? How can the Scriptures answer this question of questions, if they are only a chrestomathy of religious teachings that lack the element of harmony and unity? In this respect too the unity of the Scriptures guarantees the reliability or basis upon which Christian life and faith can be founded and thrive. Without such a unity, our faith has no foundation save our own subjective notions. From both a theoretical and a practical point of view the denial of the unity of the Scriptures destroys these Scriptures for Christian faith and life.

True it is that the conviction of this unity is primarily and ever a matter of faith, and only secondarily at best a matter of demonstration by ordinary processes of argumentation. In this regard it shares the fate of our faith in the inspiration of the Word. This too is a matter that must be believed and cannot be proved by logic or historical or literary evidence. At best and at most argument and logic can show that the objections voiced against the inspiration and the unity of these collections of sacred writings are without reason and ground, and that the so-called contradictions of the Scriptures are such only in the imagination of the critic; but this is only negative and apologetical work. The positive conviction of the reliability and the unity and inner harmony of the teachings of the Word is a matter of faith, a certainty based on the power of the Holy Spirit that works through the Word itself and awakens the assurance that what is here said and taught is truth and is life. In the very nature of the case this positive conviction, both in kind and in degree of moral certainty, cannot be anything else

but a moral and spiritual assurance based upon the influence of the Holy Spirit. Like all other matters of prime and fundamental importance in the faith, creed and life of the Christian, the unity of the Scriptures is a matter of inner conviction effected through an agency and power that is not operative in any other sphere of thought or existence but in Christianity and there gives a certainty that cannot be achieved in any other way. Accordingly too the unity of the Scriptures is something that cannot be proved by ordinary processes to anybody who will not accept it on the grounds of the activity of the Holy Spirit. It can be as little *proved* as can its correlative truth of inspiration. But for that reason it is none the less certain. Indeed it is more so than if it were dependent on argument and the evidences that the intellectual processes of the mind can furnish. Spiritual certainty is the highest degree of certainty for him who has experienced this certainty, although it is not of a demonstrable character. And the unity of the Scriptures is a matter of such spiritual certainty; is an article of faith, and for that reason something that is a priori sure in the heart of the Christian even before by actual examination of the data and facts of the Scriptures he sees that practically too the Scriptures teach but *one* truth and inculcate but *one* system of doctrine and dogma.

And being a truth of this kind and character it will be impossible that an actual examination of the contents of the Scriptures can overthrow it. The Christian knows before hand through the testimony of the Holy Spirit that there is but one truth in the Scriptures, and that accordingly all attempts at demonstrating that there are contradictions or two or more kinds of teachings mutually exclusive must fail, and that all facts and data that would seem to speak against the unity of the Scriptures seem so only because they are misunderstood and misinterpreted. Even if a Christian is not able to reconcile two or more statements of the Scriptures he will not for that reason accept that these cannot be reconciled, but rather that, when properly understood, they will be and must be in harmony, and that every fair

test and examination will show that this is the case. The best proof that this is the correct position to take is the fact that among the thousands of so-called contradictions, blunders, mistakes, errors, etc., that have been claimed to exist in the writings of the Old and the New Testament there is not a single one that has not yielded to a reasonable explanation by the efforts of correct principles of apologetics and criticism. Not one has been found where it can be fairly said: "there there must be an error."

In short, when viewed from both the theoretical and the practical point of view, the old doctrine of the unity of the Scriptures still stands and will stand, and the Church does wisely in defending it at all hazzards, for without it the foundations of truth are undermined and theology has lost its basis.

THE PRACTICAL TREATMENT OF SECRETISTS IN CHURCH AND MISSION WORK.*

BY REV. J. M. SENTER, DALLAS, N. C.

In these latter days, when the Church of Christ is beset with all manner of dangers, one of the worst forms of error with which she must contend is the error of secretism. Secretism is spreading everywhere. The cities and towns all over the country are honeycombed with it. Under a thousand different names and with a thousand different ways of catching men in its toils, it is threatening the very existence of all true Christian life and of the true use of the means of grace. When the question of lodgery is agitated in the churches and when disciplinary measures are taken to protect the Church against the lodge, how often do lodge members cry out: "Leave the lodge? No! we will sooner leave the Church!" Thus men are ready to forsake an institution founded by Christ Himself for an institution founded by man — ready to forsake the only true means of grace given by the Lord, for the

* Paper discussed by the Concorda District.

false way of the lodge — the doctrines and commandments of men!

This question of secretism is seriously troubling many of our people. It is reported among us that a number of our pastors and congregations have given way to the onslaughts of secretism and have become infected with its poison; that they are not in harmony with Joint Synod's position on the question of secret societies; that some congregations have expunged from their constitutions the clause forbidding membership in the lodge; that others, though they permit the anti-secret society clause to remain in the constitution, nevertheless regard it as a dead letter, making no effort to enforce it and acting directly contrary to it. It may be that rumor makes out a worse case than really exists. Be that as it may, we know that the question of our treatment of secretists confronts us at every turn, and most of us must dispose of it in practice as well as in theory. Hence a discussion of this question will not be out of place, but on the contrary timely, and even necessary, that we may be agreed and enabled to act in unity in this matter.

In the discussion of this question, and in our conclusions concerning the same, the Word of God, and that alone, must be our guide. Questions of policy or mere expediency may not enter here, much less questions of popularity or earthly benefits. It is a warfare between truth and error, therefore a question of right and wrong — and therefore to be decided according to God's Word.

The Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States, recognizing the danger to which her people are constantly subjected because of secretism, has laid down a Rule, founded upon the Word of God, for the guidance of her people, that they may remain faithful, not only to the Synod, but also and especially to the Church of Christ and to the truth of God's Word. That Rule, whether read from the Holy Scriptures direct or from the summary expression employed by Joint Synod, forbids fellowship "with the unfruitful works of darkness" taught and practiced by Christless secret societies.

The Rule reads as follows: "The rule among us must be, and ever remain, that members of secret societies can not be received as members of our congregations, nor may they continue their membership or be admitted to the Holy Supper an indefinite length of time."

I. *This Rule is drawn from the Word of Truth.* What it maintains is maintained by the Scriptures, and what it forbids is forbidden by God. Otherwise Joint Synod would have no right to promulgate such a rule. It can be proven, and has been proven to the satisfaction of Joint Synod, that secretism "inculcates rationalistic principles subversive of Christianity, destroying souls by leading them to trust in another righteousness than that of Christ, and to engage in another worship than that of the triune God, while at the same time it abuses the sacred oath and teaches and practices a so-called charity that is not in harmony with the Gospel." All this the Scriptures of course forbid, and equally of course all this the Synod has a right to forbid, nay more, she has the solemn duty to forbid it!

Membership in the lodge is inconsistent with membership in the Church. It involves a denial of Christ as the only Savior and denial of the means instituted by Christ as the only ordinary means of grace. The lodge arrogates to itself equal authority and power with the Church to bring salvation unto men. We could not, therefore, remain faithful to the Church if we did not oppose the lodge.

Because this Rule against secretism is drawn from the Word of God, no exceptions to the Rule are allowable. It applies to every case and every occasion. Fellowship with the unfaithful works of darkness is forbidden to all at all times and under all circumstances. No matter what the circumstances may be, or what crosses, losses or hardships it may cost individual members, pastors or congregations, the Rule must be enforced, simply because the requirements of the rule are the requirements of God's eternal Word! If this Rule could be dispensed with in any case it could be dispensed with in all cases. But it cannot be dispensed with in any case. Love toward God bids us to

oppose error and *to avoid* errorists and false religions at all times and under all circumstances; and love toward our fellow-man bids us to warn him against error and errorists and to entreat him to come out from amongst them and be separate from them. And if men will not hear our warnings and pleadings and continue to turn deaf ears to the truth and blind eyes to the light, all that is left for us to do is to exclude them from fellowship with us. 2 Cor. 6, 14-18. Just as certainly as we cannot make exceptions favorable to any other error, so certainly we dare not make exceptions favorable to secretism.

It is not necessary now to enter into any argument for the correctness and righteousness of the Rule. That, as we said above, has already been done to Synod's satisfaction. We have arrived at our standpoint on the question of secretism only after due consideration and earnest deliberations in the conventions both of the Joint Synod proper and of each of the Districts separately. The Synod believes without doubt that her position on this question is the true, biblical and only right one.

The Rule, therefore, must be enforced in all cases, not merely because it is the Rule of Joint Synod, but because it states the requirements of God's Word.

II. How shall the Rule be enforced? In our judgment there is but one way to do it, and that is strictly to carry out the requirements of the Rule, making no exceptions and no differences between individuals or congregations.

Let us take a closer view of the parts of this Rule that we may see exactly what it requires of us.

In the *first* place, it concerns the admission to fellowship with the Christian of members of secret societies. The Rule says: "That members of secret societies cannot be received as members of our congregations." Those who are not members of the Church, but who are members of secret societies cannot be admitted to membership in the congregation until they have renounced secretism, with its anti-Christian religion, its false worship, its false oath and

its false charity. To admit them would be to admit error to fellowship with truth. Nay, more, it would be partaking of the error and becoming guilty with those who hold it. Of course, congregations must seek to gain members of secret societies just as they seek to gain those who are sinners in other respects. But just as any other errorist must first renounce the error of his way before he can be admitted into membership with the congregation, so must the secretist. To admit him with his manifest sin unconfessed and unrenounced, with the intention of afterwards endeavoring to do the work necessary to qualify him for true church membership is not only bad policy, but is flagrant contempt of the requirements of God's Word. It could not be much worse to admit him without any intention of disturbing him in his error or seeking to turn him from his sin! The Rule does not forbid making true Christians of secretists, but it does forbid the reception of secretists into our congregations while they are yet secretists.

Secondly, The Rule concerns the manner of dealing with those who may fall into the error of secretism after they have become members of the Christian congregation. To quote the words of this part of the Rule: "Nor may they continue their membership or be admitted to the Holy Supper an indefinite length of time." About this second clause of the Rule there has been some misunderstanding and contention. Because the word "indefinite" is used in the connection in which it stands, some have claimed that the Rule itself is indefinite. If, say they, secretists may not remain in the congregation for an indefinite length of time, what is the definite length of time to be given them in which to repent of, confess and renounce their error, or failing in this, to be excommunicated? But this shows a misinterpretation of the Rule. Because it is said that secretists may not remain with the congregation an indefinite length of time, it does not follow that a certain number of days, weeks or months are to be named by the congregation, in which stated time the offender must repent and re-

nounce or be excommunicated; no more than it follows that we can prolong the time of his probation beyond a definite point of time. That definite point is ascertained, not by counting days, but by reaching a certain stage in the development of the particular case in hand. The Rule simply means that the offender must be given to understand that sooner or later his relations with secret societies must cease, or else he must be excluded from the congregation. So long as he is willing to hear instruction he must be borne with and the proper instruction given. But when he will no longer permit himself to be taught in the truth as opposed to the error which he holds, then the definite time has arrived for his exclusion, and *then* the congregation is bound to exclude him.

It will be pertinent here to insert a quotation from "Uniform Praxis in the Combat of Lodgery" — a work of the Mississippi Conference of the Wisconsin Synod. We quote point C under Part II: "*We are at harmony about the* MANNER *of battling* (against the lodge).

"1. With reference to all members who are in danger of being drawn into the meshes of the lodges, to *safeguard* them. To accomplish this we deem necessary:

"*a*) Public instruction from the Word of God concerning the anti-Christian spirit of the lodge. (Lectures, etc.)

"*b*) That congregations define their position and state their confession over against the lodge. (Constitution).

"*c*) Private admonition at suitable opportunities.

"2. In reference to such members of the church who have already entered the lodge, to *reclaim* them. Our manner is not —

"*a*) Simply to strike them from the list of members; that would be no attempt to gain them. Matt. 18, 15.

"*b*) Nor that we *only* legally demand: You must secede! That would be against the spirit of the Gospel. But our manner is:

"*a*) That we patiently indoctrinate and seek to convince them. 2 Tim. 4 ,2.

"*b*) That we continually do this most necessary work and not in a perfunctory manner. Jer. 48, 10.

"*c*) That we, however, exclude all such from the Christian congregation who stubbornly resist the instruction from God's Word, and will not submit to God's clear Word, as manifest infidels (non-Christians).

"3. With reference to our confession and testimony against the tenor of the lodge at *public burials.*

"*a*) We grant no lodge-brother outside of the Christian congregation a church-burial. Matt. 8, 22.

"*b*) If a member of the congregation die, who from some cause or other still belonged to the lodge, we bury such, if no manifest godliness was apparent, as a member of the congregation, but not as of the lodge. Therefore we suffer not that the lodge makes any of its anti-Christian confessions at the burial, be it by displaying of ensigns or by prayers or such like."

So far the quotation. And with this we are in harmony.

Thirdly, With reference to admission to communion, we believe that so long as the secretist is willing to hear instruction in God's Word and manifests a disposition to be guided by the truth when he knows it, but still professes his inability to see any error involved in his connection with the lodge, he should be admitted to the Lord's Supper; but so soon as he confesses a conviction of the anti-Christian character of the lodge, yet desires still to retain his nominal membership in the same for the sake of earthly gain, then he should be excluded from the communion and treated, not as a member in good standing, but as a member under discipline.

Fourthly, The Rule applies in all cases alike, as has already been said. No difference can be made in its application to organized and well-established congregations on the one hand and to weak missions or newly organized and struggling congregations on the other hand. The fact that the application of the Rule in mission work may increase opposition and make the work of gathering a congregation

far more difficult than if the question of secretism were not agitated, is no valid reason why we should pursue any other course than that which God's Word demands. If the Rule is right for the old, established congregation, it is right for the newly-begun mission. It is not a question of policy, but a question of obedience or disobedience to God's Word. In so far as the question of secretism is concerned there can be no difference between "Church-work" and "Mission-work." Church work is mission work, and mission work is Church work so far as dealing with sin and error is concerned. We cannot allow members of the Church to go on in sin without reproof and without discipline. And neither can we allow it in missions. A sin that excludes a man from fellowship with an established congregation must exclude him from membership in a mission congregation. One who is fit for membership in a mission is fit for membership in an old established congregation. How can there be any difference? Would we admit secretists to membership in our missions and to fellowship at the altar, and then as soon as the mission becomes sulf-supporting lay down the rule that they must leave the lodge or leave the Church? Is the Word of God our guide under all circumstances, or can we dispense with certain portions of it while we are endeavoring to build up a congregation out of a mission? Certainly it must be our guide in all cases. And when we come to that guide in order to learn who can be admitted to membership in our missions and to our altars, in mission congregations, it lays down the rule for application there: "Have no fellowship with the unfaithful works of darkness." And that rule we must obey, that guide we must follow, even though our course should raise such a storm of opposition to the truth that our work in a particular locality must be entirely abandoned! What have we to do with results? Only the Word of God; follow faithfully its precepts and leave results to God! He knows what is best and when He tells us what to do let us do it. We can never measure wisdom with Him and hope to succeed.

If we could dispense with the Rule in any case, we could better do it in the case of a well-established congregation than in the case of a weak mission. It is less dangerous to build rotten material into the wall that rests on a good foundation than it is to lay the foundation itself with rotten material.

Fifthly, The Rule holds good with reference to the *relation of congregations to Synod.* A congregation admitting secretists to its communion cannot become a member of Synod for the same reason that a lodge-member cannot become a member of the congregation. And a congregation of Synod, having fallen into the error of lodgery, cannot continue her membership, or be admitted to altar-fellowship with Synod for an indefinite length of time. The same interpretation of the Rule must obtain with reference to the congregation's relation to Synod as with reference to the individual's relation to the congregation. The same manner in which the congregation deals with the individual must be the Synod's manner of dealing with the erring congregation.

It is the visitator's duty to inquire concerning the attitude of the congregation towards the crying sins and popular errors of the time, hence also to inquire concerning the congregation's attitude towards lodgery. If he finds that the congregation has fallen, or is in danger of falling, into the error of secretism, he must pursue the same course he is bound to pursue in regard to any other error he may discover in the congregation — namely, set forth the true position, warn against the error, seek to remedy the wrong. If he fails in this he must report accordingly to the president of Synod, who in turn, if he himself cannot properly adjust the matter, must bring it to Synod's attention, and Synod must apply her Rule in the same manner that the congregation applies it to individual members.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and *avoid* them. For they that are such serve

not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Rom. 16, 17. 18.

"*Beware* of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits." Matt. 7, 15. 16.

"Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? That the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than He?" 1 Cor. 10, 18-22.

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. 6, 14-18.

". . . . Walk as chilldren of light, . . . proving what is acceptable unto the Lord. *And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret.*"

NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

The Old Testament Apocryphal books have a fixed place in Biblical literature. They are found in the Septuagint translation, scattered among the canonical, and, as a seprate group, in the German and other modern translations. The English Church and with it the British and Foreign Bible Society, has always in principle been opposed to publishing them in its Bibles, even with the proviso of Luther, who adds to his version: "These are books not to be put on an equality with the Sacred Scriptures, yet are useful and good to read." The value of these books, together with such Apocalypses as the Book of Enoch, Fourth Ezra and such lyrics as the Psalms of Solomon,.all dating from the inter-Testament period, is now recognized in all lands, as they furnish the data and facts for a proper understanding of the historical background of the New Testament period. Several of these, chiefly Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Book of the Maccabees, are of exceptional value and by some investigators esteemed more highly than certain of the canonical writings of the Old Testament, notably Esther and Koheleth.

In almost every particular the New Testament Apocrypha form a marked contrast to those of the Old. The term does not even stand for a fixed group of books. In the newest and best collection of these books, published recently in German translation, with introductions and notes by Pastor Edgar Hennecke, in conjunction with fifteen other savants (Tübingen and Leipzig. Mohr. 1904, pp. 588, 8vo), the editor states that by the New Testament Apocrypha are to be understood all those non-canonical writings current in the early Christian church before the times of Origen (died 254), which claim to be and were more or less generally recognized to be of apostolic origin and were regarded as sources for the times of Jesus and the

Apostles. Some of these have been fairly well known to scholars and even to the general reader, such as the Apostolic Fathers, claiming to be the writings of the immediate disciples of the Twelve. Others are little known or have only recently been discovered.

These books can readily be divided into six groups, viz: Gospels, Epistles, Doctrinal writings and Sermons; Church Orders, Apocalpyses, Apostles Stories. Of these the Gospels are perhaps the most interesting. A special edition of these has been published in the original tongues as far as possible and in German translation by Preasschen, in his "Antilegomena, Die Reste der ausserkanonischen Evangelien" (Giessen, 1901. pp. 175), this last in general, agreeing with that of Henneke. Naturally the most interesting in this group are the so-called "Agrapha," or Lord's sayings, that were current in the early Church traditionally but were not made a part of our gospels, and of which the New Testament itself furnishes an example in the words in Acts 20, 35: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," which are by Paul ascribed to Christ, but are not recorded in the gospels. Of such "Logia" of Christ, Preusschen has discovered twenty-four, to which must yet be added those recently unearthed in the papyrus finds of Oxyrrhenchus in Egypt by Grenfel and Hunt. The gospel of the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Egyptians have special doctrinal tendencies, more or less heretical, which latter is a marked feature also of the Gospel of the Ebionites. The Gospel of Peter is better known than these, as it was discovered and published only a few years ago. There are also fragments of gnostic gospels, purposing to read the errors of gnosticism into the early records of christianity. Probably the most noteworthy section in this group are the childhood gospels of Christ, which are the outgrowth of the curiosity of the early Christians to know what the canonical gospels have passed over in silence with reference to the childhood and adolescence of Christ. As a class of literature they are entirely unworthy of the great subject they pretend to describe, the purpose to a

larger extent being to show that Jesus as a child, in His play and His dealings, both for good purposes and for bad, made use of His divine power, notably his omniscience and His ability to perform miracles, to the confusion of his associates and of his parents. Scarcely any better argument for the inspired character of the canonical gospels can be found than a comparison with these pseudo-gospels. Especially characteristic is the history, of the childhood of the Lord by Thomas the Israelitish Philosopher, from which we quote a few episodes:

On the Sabbath day the child Jesus made twelve sparrows out of clay, and many other Jewish children were playing with him. A Jew passing by upbraided them for desecrating the Sabbath. And Joseph said to Jesus, "Why are you doing unlawful things on the Sabbath?" Then Jesus clapped his hands and cried to the sparrows: Fly away! and they flew away. And the Jews were frightened.

On one occasion the son of Hamar the Scribe, disturbed Jesus while at play, and Jesus became angry and cried out: You godless fool! your hand shall become withered like a fir tree. And the boy's hand become withered at once.

On another occasion a boy ran up against Jesus. This embittered Jesus, and he said: You shall not reach the end of your race. And the boy fell down and died.

After some days Jesus was playing on the roof of a house with others, and one fell down and died. The parents accused Jesus of having thrown him down, but Jesus jumped down and stood by the dead body and cried out: Zenon! Arise, and tell us if I threw you down; and the dead arose and said: No, Lord!

The Gospel of James is devoted entirely to an account of the wonderful birth and virgin character of the mother of Jesus, while the Acts of Pilate claim to be a letter of Pilate addressed to Claudius Tiberius on the death of Christ. The letter of King Abgar, of Edessa, addressed to Christ, is an appeal to have the famous healer come to Syria and cure him, and the writer expresses his faith in Jesus as the

Son of God. As the pretended answer of Jesus is the only writing that is ever attributed to the Lord, it is reproduced here:

"Blessed art thou if thou believest in me without having seen me. For it is written of me that those who have seen me do not believe in me, and that those who have not seen me shall believe and live. In regard to what thou hast written to me to come to thee, it is necessary for me to fulfill all things here for what I was sent, and after their fulfillment to ascend to Him who has sent me. And when I shall have ascended I will send thee one of my disciples, that he may cure thee and offer life to thee and to thine."

It is then reported that after the ascension of Christ Thaddeus, one of the seventy, was sent and did these things.

Of letters the edition of Hennecke contains those of Clemens to the Corinthians, of Ignatus and Polycarp, and a letter to the Laodiceans, all but the last generally included in the Apostolic Fathers. The so-called Second Letter of Clemens is now generally accepted as the first Christian sermon extant; and the doctrinal writings include the well known Letter of Barnabas, the Matthew tradition, and the Mission Sermon of Peter. The former Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, together with the Syriac Didascalia, constitute the rubric of the Church Order. The Apocalypses are particularly interesting, especially on account of their fantastic contents, including the Revelation of Peter, the long and sometimes tedious Shepherd of Hermas, and a number of pretended Old Testament pseudepigraphia, such as the Ascension of Isaiah, 5 and 6 Ezre, and the Christian Sibylline Order. The history of the Apostles constitutes the bulk of the last group, including Acts of Paul, of Peter, of John, of Andrew, and of Thomas. A number of these are quite lengthy and not without historical value.

These writings constitute a remarkable group of books hovering around the New Testament. The East and the West have both contributed to this collection, Syria and Egypt, Palestine and Asia-Minor, Italy and Greece being represented. Some of them are complete, others preserved

only in fragments, and all deal with some phase in the wonderful vicisitudes of thought and life in the early Christian Church. They are more than curiosities of literature, and a careful student can study them to advantage. A number of them are pronounced in advocating certain heretical tendencies of thought. This is notably the case with Judaistic Christianity and agnosticism. In the Gospel of the Hebrew the law and the prophets are still the norm of life, and James is the greatest of the apostles. In the Gospel of the Ebionites Sabbath celebration and circumcision are still a part of Christianity and modify the doctrine of the person of Christ. The gnostic fragments teach that Jesus had no real body, and in their asceticism the Gnostics used only water in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Their writings here are fascinating romance, fantastic fables, filled with visions and dreams, with countless miraculous healings and spiritual apparitions. A contrast of these works with the New Testament only emphasizes the fact that the early Church, under the guidance of the Spirit, chose wisely and well the books that were to constitute its canon of sacred writings, the court of final appeal in all matters of faith and life.

SYNODICAL SERMON.

BY REV. O. S. OGLESBY, A. M., PITTSBURG, PA.

Ephesians 4, 1-3.

Beloved Brethren in the Christian Ministry:

Men called to a high, honorable and responsible position, are obligated to live a life in harmony with that position. All Christians have received and accepted such a call. It is a call to be kings and priests in the kingdom of Him who hath called us. *No call ever* invited to higher honors, involved greater responsibilities, or promised a more glorious recompense. In the words of our text we find the earnest appeal of one who had received and ac-

cepted this call, addressed to all others who have received and accepted it, to "Walk worthy" of this high calling.

While these words apply to all Christians, they have a special application to us, brethren, who have not only been called to that kingship and priesthood to which all Christians are called, but also have been called of God to a special position in His kingdom of grace, the Christian Church. We are called to be "embassadors," "co-workers," "messengers," "pastors," "teachers," "shepherds," "bishops," "overseers," for, in, and of the flock of God, which call "is not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead." Gal. 1, 1.

We then, who are called to special positions in the household of God, are under special obligations to "Walk worthy of the calling wherewith we are called," and this earnest appeal and prayer of the apostle may properly be considered by us, as it especially applies to us, and in this light we shall endeavor, by the help of the Holy Spirit to consider it on this occasion.

THE WORTHY WALK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER.

1. *It is to walk in lowliness and meekness.*

a.) In lowliness.

Though that vocation to which we are called is the most exalted to which men can be called in this world, the life which is worthy of this calling is not of that kind which men regard as exalted. It is much rather of the very opposite character, a life of lowliness, of humility, of serving rather than being served.

That life which the Lord Jesus set before us as an example of the life we are to live while in His service here below, is not that life which He lived with the Father before Abraham was, nor yet that life which He now lives since His resurrection from the dead, but it is that life which He lived here upon earth, His life from Bethlehem to Calvary, a life of lowliness, among the lowly and for the lowly, that life to which He invites us when He says, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and

lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Matt. 11, 29.

Our blessed teacher was "lowly in heart." Though *God,* He became man, not one of earth's exalted, and honored, but one of earth's lowly and despised. He chose His disciples, not from the courts and the schools, but from the fisherman's boats, and the publican's stand. He was not elated by the attentions of the rich, nor embarrassed by the petitions of the beggar. The loathsome leper, humble, penitent, and beseeching, was the subject of His words of love and miracle of grace, while the haughty Pharisee, and those clothed in purple and fine linen impenitent, and selfish, were the subjects of His reproofs, and denunciations.

Though possessing the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, these treasures were, in a measure, "hid in Him," He manifesting these glorious attributes only so far as the good of men, and the glory of God required. Such, dear brethren, He would have us to be. That we be not deluded by the gold and glitter of this world. That we be not deceived by the pomp and vanity, and empty promises of worldly wealth and honor. That we have not our affections set upon the things of this world, but that we love the things that are above, and have our joy and hope, and trust, and confidence in the things that are of God, and which God gives, and which He requires. "That we mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." That we "be not wise in our own conceits," "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." Rom. 12. 3. Surely, we poor sinners, weak and uncertain, yet with mighty responsibilities, have nothing of which to boast, or for which to exalt ourselves, but every reason for true humility, and love unfeigned.

b.) *In meekness.*

But He whose servants we are, and whose life we accept as our example, not only set us an example of lowli-

ness, but also of meekness. *What is meekness?* It is not a theory, but a spirit, a disposition of the hart and mind. It is the spirit or disposition with which Christ met those who sought His destruction, and who by word and deed dreadfully wronged Him, and with which He rebuked those wrongs and sought to correct them. It was not a spirit of *retaliation,* nor of revenge, but it was a spirit of patience, such as he adone could exercise, a spirit which emanates from God, and which those only, who are born of God, and taught of God, can, or will, teach, or practice.

It is a spirit which leads to a course, when treating with enemies, which is the very opposite of that which the world pursues under like circumstances. Which does not demand an "eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," but a spirit which reviles not the reviler, "thinketh no evil," "avenges not itself," "is not overcome of evil, but overcometh evil with good."

Our blessed Master had many enemies, potent and persistent enemies. He was stricken, smitten, and afflicted. "He was oppressed and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth." Isa. 53. "Who when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered, He threatened not, but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously. 1 Peter 2, 23.

In this spirit of meekness He would have us walk, dear brethren. In this spirit of meekness He would have us meet our enemies, however furious, potent, or persistent. In this spirit of meekness He would have us reprove and seek to correct the wrongs they may do us, however gross those wrongs may be. The apostle who wrote the words of our text, speaking of himself and of those who with him follow the example of Christ, says: "Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat." 1 Cor. 4, 12-13. This spirit of meekness, and this alone, will lead us to obey that injunction of our Lord, when He says: "Love your enemies, bless them

that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." Matt. 5, 44. To walk in this spirit of meekness is essential to that walk which is worthy of our calling, brethren.

II. *It is to walk with long suffering and forbearance.*

a.) *With long-suffering.*

Another feature of the life which is worthy of the Christian's calling, the apostle describes by the word "long-suffering." The power of long-suffering is not an element of human nature, it is a gift of God's grace, perfected through Christian experience. "Tribulation worketh patience." This long-suffering is a *soul power* which God imparts to His children, that they may be enabled to endure the tribulations which they must encounter, to bear the crosses which divine wisdom imposes, and the burdens which human ignorance and Satanic malice inflict. In that life which our Lord has placed before us for our example, no characteristic is more prominent than His long-suffering, and no Christian minister leads a life worthy of his calling except this same characteristic stands out with evident prominence, known and read of all men. With long-suffering our Savior endured the contradiction and persecutions of those whom He came to save, astounding them, not by a revelation of His omnipotence, but by the exercise of unparalleled patience, and when the hour came that He must pay the ransom demanded for the souls of men, He met that fiery trial with a patience and long-suffering which amazed those who witnessed it, and continues to amaze all who hear of it. The same path our Savior trod, we must also tread. No Christian, and least of all, the Christian minister, can expect to escape the temptations of Satan, the contradictions of men, or the chastisements of the Lord. "For whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." Heb. 12, 6. No Christian minister can follow the example of his Lord, or live the life worthy of his calling, except he possesses, and constantly exercises the god-given grace of long-suffering.

b.) Forbearing one another in love.

The apostle, having enumerated the virtues essential to the life worthy of the Christian's calling, also urges the practice of these virtues in the words, — "Forbearing one another in love." There is a crying need of forbearance in the Christian church, not only among the laity, but among us also, my brethren in the ministry.

So long as there are faults and failures among those who compose the membership of the church, this admonition to "Forbear one another in love," is needful, and for none is it more needful than for the Christian minister. He, most of all, is subject to the injuries which these faults and failures work. He, most of all, must labor for their correction, and must, most of all, exercise those virtues which tend to the correction of faults, that he may have the powerful aid of a worthy example in his efforts to correct the faults of others. Here we can not apply the old maxim, "Like cures like." We cannot meet the irritable, and the vindictive, with irritability, and vindictiveness, but we must meet them with the opposite of these passions, that is, with forbearance, and this too, not only when we deal with our lay brethren, but also when we deal with our clerical brethren — "Forbearing *one another* in love."

To this forbearance we should be moved by a two-fold consideration, namely, our need of the forbearance of our brethren, and our love for our brethren. Each one should ever remember that the fault is not *always,* and entirely with others, and when seeking to correct the faults of others, do so in the spirit of meekness, with forbearance, considering his own weaknesses. Gal. 6, 1. But there is a purer and a stronger motive urging us to forbear one another, and that is the love which each Christian minister should have for his brethren.

We are brethren, for we all have one God and Father, are all redeemed by one Savior, are all born of one Spirit, are all the children of one spiritual mother, called to the same office, pledged to the same confession of faith, are all soldiers of one army, servants of one Master, giving our

life's service to one common cause. Hence, as brethren, we should love as brethren, which love will cover a *multitude* of faults in our brethren. Putting away all wrath, strife, bitterness, unholy ambition, and Satanic jealousies, "Look not every man upon his own things, but also upon the things of others," and "Let each esteem others better than himself." Let our judgment of each other, and of the acts of each other, be like the judgment of Christ, neither encouraging the careless, nor making despondent the conscientious, not making great things out of little things, nor little things out of great things. It is essential to the worthy life of Christian ministers that we "forbear one another in love."

III. *It is to walk in unity and peace.*

a.) *In unity.*

The apostle Paul had an ardent love for the Church of Christ. For her sake he was a willing and cheerful "prisoner of the Lord." He also had a clear conception of what her interests required, and in seeking her welfare, he earnestly entreats her children, and servants to *"endeavor;"* that is to be diligent, vigilant, careful, "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

Unity among the members of the church is an absolute condition of the prosperity of the church. A house divided against itself will fall. A body with the members at war with each other must die. The Christian church is a body, the body of Christ, with many members, and her welfare, yea, her existence, in any one locality, or organization, demand that those members preserve unity among themselves. That unity which we are to endeavor to keep, is not a unity in external and indifferent matters, such as form, government, or dress. To the life and prosperity of the church, it is not essential that we all assume the same posture in prayer, or that we all use the same liturgy, or that we all have the same form of government, however *desirable* these things may be, yet, many, in striving after unity in these things, overlook and even despise weightier matters. That unity to which the apostle here so earnestly

admonishes us, is an internal union, or unity of the spirit, of faith.

In the Christian Church there is but one Spirit, whom God sends, and whom we are to receive as our teacher, namely, the Holy Spirit, who *alone* proceeds from the Father and the Son. This is the Spirit and the only Spirit, who is authorized, and able and willing to lead us into all truth, and of this one Spirit, dear brethren, we all have been taught, thanks be to God.

Moreover, brethren, this one Spirit teaches the same truths to all His pupils, and has taught us that there is but one God, the Triune God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. He teaches us but *one* faith, that faith which, with all confidence lays hold upon Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in whom, and in whom *alone*, there is salvation. He teaches us that there is but one baptism, the essentials of which are water and the Word of God, intended for all men, of whatever age or race; the means of God's gracious forgiveness of sins, and of eternal life. These are the things of the Spirit, the things which the Holy Spirit hath taught us, and these are the things in which we are to endeavor to keep the unity. In these things we are all to know, to believe, to confess, and to teach the same things, that "we may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The most earnest, and diligent, and persistent, and careful, and prayerful "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit," is an essential requirement of the worthy walk of a Christian minister.

b.) *In the bond of peace.*

Not only does the apostle entreat us to keep this unity of the Spirit, but he urges us to keep it in a certain way, namely, "in the bond of peace." That peace in which we are to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, is not that peace which may exist among those who are indifferent to each other's actions, or among those who simply respect each other, or who may have a mutual worldly interest in each other's work, but it is that peace which is to be found among those who truly love one another, and where

each holds the work of the other as the work of his own Master, whom he loves above all things, and where each regards the success of his brother as the work of his God, having the same pleasure therein as if it were his own success. Each will then dread the disturbance of this peace as he dreads the dishonor of his God, as he dreads an injury to the work for which God designed him, and to which he has pledged his life, for which he has sacrificed the things of this world, the aim of which is the salvation of his own soul, as also the souls of his fellowmen. If we truly love our Master and His cause, we will dread an injury to this cause, and will therefore dread a disturbance of the peace of Zion, and will not thoughtlessly, carelessly, or hastily contribute to its destruction. We will not consent that it be destroyed for anything of less worth than the glory of God, and the good of souls and we will ever be ready and willing to make every *permissible* sacrifice for the preservation of this peace among us.

The bond of this peace is the covenant of grace, made with Abraham, and renewed with David, and sealed with the precious blood of David's Son. It is the possession of one Spirit, the Holy Spirit. It is the possession of that one faith, given by the same Father, embracing the same Savior, and rewarded with the same gift of eternal life. That one common faith confessed by us all in the same words, pledging to the same life and work, is a divine bond of peace which none can lightly sever.

A glorious bond it is, binding each to God, and each to the other. We cannot thoughtlessly sever this blood-sealed covenant, this divine bond of brotherly love. They who do sever it, do so at the risk of the honor of God, of the souls of their brethren, yea, of their own souls. May God grant that we, each and every one, may diligently give heed to this earnest admonition "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," and thus walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. Amen.

NOTES.

SWEDISH CHURCH AFFAIRS.

At the recent general convention of the churches of Sweden, held in Stockholm, the most important resolution dealt with the introduction of a new version of the Old Testament. A special commission, of which Professor Tegenér is the chairman, had prepared a tentative translation and the work done met the approval of the Synod. This was all the more remarkable as the specimens of the coming revision of the Old King Gustavus Bible of 1541, which Professor Tegenér, in conjunction with Professor Ruden had been publishing in installments during the past months had been rather severly criticised, the commission being charged with making too great concessions to liberal exegesis, especially on the rendering of the Messianic passages, going in this respect about as far as the German Halle revisers did in 1878. By this act, however, this new version has practically been introduced into the Church, the Synod, however, refraining from authoritatively indorsing it and making it the official Bible for church and school because the publication of a new version of the New Testament is also expected, the work of preparing it having been carried on for several years. A revised New Testament, the work of Archbishop Sundberg, Professor Johanssen and Probet Toren, appeared in 1884, but could never secure official sanction. The work of revising the translation of the whole Swedish Bible will now soon be completed. The Stockholm convention deliberated and debated for days on the civil marriage problem, two committee reports having been presented, one demanding a civil marriage only in the case of divorced persons and the other such a ceremony in all cases, Bishop von Scheele, also well known in America as the represeneative of the King of Sweden at the Yale anniversary, and otherwise, was the pronounced champion of civil marriage pure and simple.

The Synod finally refused to accept either of these proposals and petitioned the government to arrange that civil marriage can be permitted instead of the ecclesiastical, as now demanded by law, whenever this kind of a ceremony is preferred. The Synod decided, as did the Parliament some months ago, that in the religious instruction in the higher classes of the public schools and in the secondary schools, the Small Catechism of Luther, which has been used for several centuries, can now be displaced by more modern text books.

MEETING OF THE "AWAY FROM ROME" MOVEMENT.

The Catholic Church of Austria is systematically at work to counteract the "Away from Rome" movement, a full report of this work being published in the influential Catholic *Volkszeitung* of Cologne. The Archbishop, Joseph Kahn, is taking the lead by seeing to it that the legal rights of the Catholics are in every case sustained in the courts. Among other things he has secured from the Supreme Court a decree that permits the Catholics to prohibit the burial of any who have gone out to Protestantism to be buried in consecrated ground. The priests too have taken up the contest, having organized a special "Rechtschutzverein" in both Lower Austria and Bohemia, which has engaged lawyers to push every case of illegal attack on the Catholic Church or her institutions. Within the last twelve months the attorney of the Association has compelled 80 Prostestant journals publicly to retract charges made against the Church. The same Association published an immense anti-Protestant literature, one of its pamphlets, entitled "Ein Griff ins Lügennetz" having appeared in 150,000 copies. It was also active in securing new recruits for the priesthood, the seminary at Leitmeritz this year reporting 124 theologians, or an increase of 35. The churches are becoming very liberal in the support of these students, the last year bringing almost 20,000 florins for this purpose. The Catholic congregations throughout the German parts of

Austria are also being aroused, as is seen from their increase in Christian activity. What in former years seemed impossible to achieve in this regard is now readily accomplished. One of these results is the erection of new churches in localities where the Away from Rome movement has been particularly active, such as Turn, Teplitz, Karlsbad, and elsewhere. Everywhere Catholic churches are being renovated; church building societies are being organized and funds collected for these purposes. Great progress is also made in securing the co-operation of the press for the interests of the Church, and many Catholic journals are now being distributed free of cost. The *Bonifaciusbote,* a leading Catholic journal of Bohemia, has now a subscription list of 200,000. What the Church still needs are secular daily and weekly papers, and these, the Archbishop recently said, would soon follow. He closed a recent proclamation to the Church with these words: "Let us work with united strength and every thing will yet turn out well."

Columbus Theological Magazine.

THIS Magazine is designed to supply the want of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim is the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

The terms are $2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers, 35 cents.

All remittances should be addressed to LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, Columbus, Ohio. All communications pertaining to the Editorial Department and all exchanges to PROF. GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH. D., Columbus, Ohio.

"The Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IN ITS FOUNDATION, ESSENCE, APPEARANCE AND WORK.

By PROF. M. LOY, D. D.

Prompted by the purest motive, the desire to serve his Master by being helpful to his fellow-laborers, fully conscious that the unscriptural views on the subject endanger the soul and should be exposed, and confident "that the King will accompany it with His blessing," the author wrote and published this work.

"This work is notable for its comprehensive and yet simple analysis of its subject, and for its earnest devotion to the practical topics and problems that spring out of the Church life at every point." — *Lutheran Church Review.*

"The work is carefully prepared and well written. — *Lutheran Observer.*

The book contains 364 pages and sells for $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE LUTHERAN COMMENTARY

By Scholars of the Lutheran Church in the United States under the editorial charge of Dr. H. E. Jacobs. This is a very valuable work and especially adapted to the wants of Pastors and Sunday-school Teachers. The 12 volumes bound in full cloth have been reduced in price from $2.00 to $1.50 per volume. We would call special attention to volume VI on the Acts of the Apostles by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. Having too large a number on hand we will sell this volume until our stock is exhausted, at $1.25 per volume. Address :: :: :: :: :: ::

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 E. MAIN ST., COLUMBUS, O.

MODEL SERMONS. SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

By DR. M. LOY, Dean in Capital University.

These sermons are first scriptural then logical; noted for their simplicity in style and depth of thought, in full harmony with the confessions of the Lutheran Church. Preachers need these sermons as models, teachers will want them to use in the public service in the absence of the pastor, parents will find them to be just what they need in the home service on Sunday, and any Christian, young or old, will find in them the Manna which came down from heaven by which his soul is nourished unto eternal life.

Price, plain cloth, $2.50; half leather, $3.00; half morocco, $4.00;
Imitation morocco, two volumes, $4.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

BEFORE THE ALTAR

OR A SERIES OF ANNOTATED PROPOSITIONS ON LITURGICS, TO WHICH IS ADDED A SELECTION OF STANDARD FORMS.

BY DR. C. H. L. SCHUETTE.

The author in his introduction remarks: "The writer will consider himself amply repaid for his labor, if this little book shall add to the number of those among God's people who worship 'with understanding:' and if ministers will take up the subject as it is here outlined and discuss it before their people, say in a course of lectures, there can be no doubt as to the result."

Price, bound in cloth, 75 cents; flexible, $1.00.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

CHRISTIAN PRAYER

By M. LOY, D. D.

This book is in fact an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Pastors are inquiring for sermons on the catechism. There is nothing better in the English language on this, the third part of the catechism. Eight articles treat *The Model Prayer* in a general way, four explain and emphasize the words "Our Father." "Hallowed be Thy Name" is explained in three articles; "Thy Kingdom Come" in four. "Thy Will be Done" in seven articles, and "Give us this day our Daily Bread" in five." "Forgive us our Debts" is treated in five articles, and each of the remaining parts of the prayer is treated in four articles. Besides all this there are fifteen articles on "The Practice of Prayer," concluding with an article on the question: "Have You Family Worship?"

People who never pray should read this book that they may be brought to a sense of their duty and privilege. Those who have not been neglecting this Christian privilege will be encouraged to continue on the right way.

Price, 75 Cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.

THE MEANS OF GRACE

BY REV. G. T. COOPERRIDER, A. M.

It furnishes a clear and adequate explanation of the Word and Sacraments, God's own appointed means for conveying to us His grace unto our salvation, rather in the light of a practical, broad interpreter than as a treatise of technicalities.

Handsomely Bound in full cloth, XIV and 157 pages. Per copy, 75 cents.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN 55 EAST MAIN STREET, COLUMBUS, O.